

**NASSAU INTERIM FINANCE AUTHORITY
NASSAU COUNTY, NEW YORK**

**STRATEGIC COST
REDUCTION ANALYSIS**



August 29, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION	1
TIMING CONSTRAINTS AND OBJECTIVES ASSOCIATED WITH THE REPORT	1
APPROACH	1
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	2
COST REDUCTIONS AT THE COUNTY LEVEL.....	2
REFERENCE TO APPENDIX A.....	5

SECTION II – SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

SUMMARY	6
COST REDUCTION INITIATIVES	6
TURNOVER SAVINGS ANALYSIS.....	21

SECTION III – EFFICIENCY COST SAVINGS STRATEGIES

SHARED SERVICES	23
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	26

SECTION IV – COUNTY OPERATIONS – KEY DEPARTMENTS AND FINDINGS

SUMMARY	28
DEPARTMENT OF ASSESSMENT	28
COUNTY ATTORNEY	29
OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS.....	31
SHERIFF/CORRECTIONAL CENTER.....	33
OFFICE OF CONSTITUENT AFFAIRS.....	34
FIRE COMMISSION.....	35
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES	37
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	39
DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION	41
POLICE DEPARTMENT	43
PARKS, RECREATION & MUSEUMS	45
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS	47
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES.....	49
COUNTY TREASURER.....	50
TRAFFIC AND PARKING VIOLATIONS AGENCY.....	51

SECTION V - CONCLUSION

APPENDIX A – BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY	55
EXPENDITURE TREND ANALYSIS	56
BUDGETARY VARIANCE TREND ANALYSIS.....	58
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS - EXPENDITURES.....	61
DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ANALYSIS	67

SECTION I – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

On November 29, 2016 Nassau County (the “County”) submitted a multi-year financial plan covering the years 2017-2020 to the Nassau Interim Finance Authority (“NIFA”). The plan was disapproved by NIFA and a modified plan was subsequently approved with conditions on December 14, 2017. Despite its approval, the plan consisted of speculative assumptions and remained structurally unsound on a Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”) basis.

NIFA commissioned Capital Markets Advisors, LLC – Strategic Consulting Group (“CMA”) to develop this report (the “Report”) to address the forecasted deficits and to identify immediate cost reductions in the County’s Major Operating Funds. Members of CMA’s Strategic Consulting Group conducted an evaluation of the County budget and key departments between March and June of 2017, with minor follow up in July and August of 2017. CMA’s Financial Advisory practice did not participate in the creation of this report.

TIMING CONSTRAINTS AND OBJECTIVES ASSOCIATED WITH THE REPORT

The scope provided for this Report was extremely narrow, with very specific tasks being outlined and a stringent timeline being imposed. As a result, CMA’s investigative analysis was restricted to only certain areas of the County’s operation. This Report details the findings associated with CMA’s limited review. Any information that may be absent is a direct consequence of the constrained timeline and limited scope. Furthermore, the initiatives detailed throughout this Report were selected for review of feasibility with County officials. Additional analysis and legal review may be required. The estimates were deemed reasonable by CMA based on their limited review, yet may be subject to change and adjustment as additional investigations are performed by CMA, NIFA or the County.

APPROACH

Due to timing constraints of the project, CMA focused on a series of targeted departments, agencies or functions of the County. Such targets either constituted a large percentage of the Major Operating Funds or were deemed important for review by CMA, NIFA or both. The Report and recommendations concentrate on the following themes: government operations (administrative and financial), public safety, correctional, health, social and human services, public works and recreational.

During the evaluation period, CMA conducted several on-site interviews with County officials, conducted a comprehensive review of available financial documents, accumulated data on comparable municipalities for the benchmarking of financial and personnel matters and participated in conversations with various industry professionals.

Baseline details relative to the fiscal conditions of the County are provided in Appendix A of the Report. Although Appendix A does not contain specific recommendations, it defines historical

trends and budgetary forecasts, which are key to understanding the recommendations. Appendix A will be referenced throughout the Report.

A summary of identified expenditure reductions is included in Section II of the Report, while more detailed discussions of the targeted departments can be found in Section IV. In total, 40 expenditure reductions were identified, totaling approximately \$81.2 million. The reductions were based on assumptions deemed to be reasonable and customary. Nevertheless, the associated cost savings resulting from each initiative should be considered approximate and subject to revision as necessary. Furthermore, although quantified, the reductions do not necessarily include execution plans. In certain instances, additional planning and analysis would be required.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Herein follows a concise summary of CMA's findings. In its abstract form, the table excludes exact details relating to the reduction initiatives. However, Section II of this Report includes a comprehensive analysis of each initiative.

COST REDUCTIONS AT THE COUNTY LEVEL

COST REDUCTIONS AT THE COUNTY LEVEL	REDUCTION INITIATIVE	DEPARTMENT	EST. TIMEFRAME	SERVICE IMPACT	EST. REDUCTION
	Privatize Ambulance Services & RFP	Police	Within Budget Season	No	\$15,500,000
	Hiring Freeze (2018)	Other	Fiscal 2018	No	15,000,000
	Eliminate Crossing Guards	Police	Fiscal 2018	Yes	14,476,496
	Transfer Or Elimination Of Park Maintenance	Parks	Fiscal 2018	No	5,608,404
	Elimination of Youth Services	Human Services	Within Budget Season	Yes	5,500,000
	Across the Board Highway Cuts	Public Works	Within Budget Season	No	5,000,000
	Elimination of VEEB Contract	Fire Commission	Within Budget Season	No	4,370,000
Closure of Marine Bureau	Police	Within Budget Season	Yes	3,942,099	

COST REDUCTIONS AT THE COUNTY LEVEL	REDUCTION INITIATIVE	DEPARTMENT	EST. TIMEFRAME	SERVICE IMPACT	EST. REDUCTION
	Legislature Staff Reduction	Other	Within Budget Season	No	\$2,696,614
	Development of Countywide Clerical Pool	Other	Within Budget Season	No	1,625,000
	Elimination of All Physical Payroll Checks	Treasurer	Within Budget Season	No	1,205,157
	Reduce Day Care	Social Services	Within Budget Season	Yes	1,200,000
	Elimination Of EMS Academy Day Care	Fire Commission	Within Budget Season	No	1,200,000
	Consolidation Of Dispatch Functions	Fire Commission	Fiscal 2018	No	1,064,000
	Elimination of Office of Minority Affairs	Other	Within Budget Season	No	962,993
	Privatize County Operated Museums	Parks	Within Budget Season	No	860,000
	Reduction Of Contractual Obligations	Assessment	Within Budget Season	No	726,000
	Merger of Human Services and Health	Human Services	Fiscal 2018	No	660,450
	Elimination of Veterans Service Agency	Other	Within Budget Season	No	660,050
	Utilization of Energy Consultant	Public Works	Within Budget Season	No	600,000
	Board of Elections Across the Board Cuts	Other	Within Budget Season	No	600,000
Fuel and Maintenance Savings	Public Works	Within Budget Season	No	\$594,000	

COST REDUCTIONS AT THE COUNTY LEVEL	REDUCTION INITIATIVE	DEPARTMENT	EST. TIMEFRAME	SERVICE IMPACT	EST. REDUCTION
	Closure of Mounted Unit	Police	Within Budget Season	Yes	584,427
	Reduction Of 5 Unfilled Budgeted Positions Or Equivalent Reduction Of Vendor Contracts	County Attorney	Within Budget Season	No	538,000
	Consolidation of IT Function	Police	N/A	No	500,000
	Shared Service - Quality Control Function	Public Works	Fiscal 2018	No	407,000
	Tank Testing Repair	Public Works	Within Budget Season	No	400,000
	Consolidate Outside Attorneys	County Attorney	Fiscal 2018	No	321,000
	Tighter Policies - Take-Home Vehicles	Public Works	Within Budget Season	No	250,000
	Elimination of Vendor Checks Through P-Cards	Treasurer	Within Budget Season	No	183,000
	Increased Use of Legal Assistants	County Attorney	Fiscal 2018	No	173,370
	Discontinue Mailing of Exemption Reminders	Assessment	Fiscal 2018	No	150,000
	Elimination Of Asbestos Project Manager	Public Works	Within Budget Season	No	113,100
	Elimination of Physical Medicare Checks	Treasurer	Within Budget Season	No	63,720
	Close or Privatize Ice Rink	Parks	Within Budget Season	No	<i>To Be Determined</i>

COST REDUCTIONS	REDUCTION INITIATIVE	DEPARTMENT	EST. TIMEFRAME	SERVICE IMPACT	EST. REDUCTION
	Staffing Reductions – Attrition	Assessment	Fiscal 2018	No	<i>*See Turnover Analysis</i>
	Bridge Maintenance Staff Reduction	Public Works	Within Budget Season	No	<i>Not Quantifiable At Present</i>
	Drafting Division Reduction	Public Works	N/A	No	<i>Not Quantifiable At Present</i>

TOTAL ESTIMATED REDUCTIONS - \$87,734,880

REFERENCE TO APPENDIX A

Appendix A incorporates a detailed assessment of the County’s operating budget and multi-year plan. While there is no singular method to evaluate such plans, a comprehensive approach focusing on both external and internal fiscal indicators was implemented to identify structural weaknesses and potential risks. Although comprehensive, the scope of the analysis was intentionally limited to certain key factors. As such, the budgetary assessment included under Appendix A of this Report served as a reliable foundation for our decision making relative to these key areas. Appendix A, should be read and considered with respect to the cost reduction initiatives detailed throughout this Report.

Appendix A includes the following elements:

- Trend Analysis
- Expenditure Variance Analysis
- Financial Ratios
- Benchmark Analysis

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

SECTION II – SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

SUMMARY

Based on the findings of our analysis, we believe the County could pursue the below series of cost reduction initiatives to achieve structural balance on a GAAP basis. The estimates associated with each initiative are subject to change during detailed design and implementation phases. While the Report provides point estimates for simplicity, they are not meant to imply a sense of precision, and a range of outcomes around each number should be expected.

COST REDUCTION INITIATIVES

ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Reduction Of Contractual Services To 2016 Levels	Immediate Or Fiscal 2018	\$726,000
	Contractual services were increased in the 2017 budget to \$756,264 from \$17,381 in 2016. Despite various inquiries, CMA was unable to determine the justification for the increase. As such, a reduction of \$726,000 is recommended.		
	ASSESSMENT – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Discontinue Mailing of Exemption Reminders	Fiscal 2018	\$150,000
	Analysis suggests postage costs could be reduced through the elimination of exemption reminders. Exemption notifications should be included in legislative district mailings. Conservatively, postage costs could be reduced by \$150,000.		

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

ASSESSMENT	ASSESSMENT – INITIATIVE #3	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Staffing Reductions – Attrition	Fiscal 2018	<i>* See Turnover Analysis</i>
	<p>The workforce of the Department is aging, with approximately 10% of fulltime staff believed to be at or near retirement age. In conjunction with a stringent NIFA imposed hiring freeze for fiscal 2018, the fulltime workforce of the Department of Assessment could be reduced through attrition. Workflow can be irregular due to the filing of property tax exemption forms. As such, seasonal employees could be utilized to offset overtime incurred during peak work-load times.</p>		
TOTAL REDUCTIONS			
DEPARTMENT OF ASSESSMENT:		\$876,000	

COUNTY ATTORNEY	COUNTY ATTORNEY – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Reduction Of 5 Unfilled Budgeted Positions Or Equivalent Reduction of Outside Vendor Contracts	Immediate Or Fiscal 2018	\$538,000
	<p>The 2017 budget includes a total of 5 budgeted but unfilled positions for the County Attorney. Such positions are not expected to be filled and can therefore be eliminated. Reduction estimates include salaries and fringe benefits correlating to the unfilled positions. Based on analysis, third party vendor contracts are believed to be reducible. If unfilled positions are not removed, contract liability should be reduced by a similar amount.</p>		
COUNTY ATTORNEY – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION	
Consolidate All Attorneys Into County Attorney's Office	Fiscal 2018	\$321,000	
<p>Redundancy can be eliminated, while economies of scale gained by consolidating all departmental attorneys into the County Attorney's office. Conservatively, 3 ordinance Attorney positions could be eliminated. Reduction estimates are inclusive of salaries and fringe benefits correlating to the consolidation.</p>			

COUNTY ATTORNEY	COUNTY ATTORNEY – INITIATIVE #3	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Increased Use of Legal Assistants	Fiscal 2018	\$173,370
	<p>The County does not make use of less expensive paraprofessional legal services. Reduction estimates include the elimination of 3 ordinance Attorney positions with an increase of 3 Legal Assistants. The reduction assumes the salary and fringe differential between Legal Assistants and Attorneys.</p>		
	TOTAL REDUCTIONS COUNTY ATTORNEY:		\$1,032,370

FIRE COMMISSION	FIRE COMMISSION – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination of VEEB Contract	Fiscal 2018	\$4,370,000
	<p>The County presently contracts with the Vocational Education and Extension Board (“VEEB”) to provide training to volunteer fire fighters. Charging costs associated with the contract to the local level would result in savings of approximately \$4.4 million. County officials have indicated it is possible a tuition based chargeback could be imposed, which would allow the County to retain the program. Additional legal analysis will be required. If eliminated, alternative opportunities for training through local Community Colleges could be further investigated. Such programs would benefit from State Aid. Additional legal analysis would be required.</p>		
	FIRE COMMISSION – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination Of County EMS Academy	Fiscal 2018	\$1,200,000
<p>The County’s EMS academy is not the sole provider of such training in the County. As such, if closed, training would still be generally accessible. It was not abundantly clear if there is a local mandate in place relating to the academy. Regardless, given the availability of alternative option the EMS Academy is an unnecessary cost.</p>			

FIRE COMMISSION	FIRE COMMISSION – INITIATIVE #3	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Consolidation Of Dispatch Functions	Fiscal 2018	\$1,064,000
	Analysis shows that dispatch services are duplicated at various levels of the County operations. Consolidating such functions would result in economies of scale.		
	TOTAL REDUCTIONS FIRE COMMISSION:		\$6,634,000

HUMAN SERVICES	HUMAN SERVICES – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination Of Youth Services	Fiscal 2018	\$5,500,000
	The Office of Youth services is operated through 40+ agency contracts at a cost that exceeds \$6.0 million. Nassau is one of the only counties in the State to provide youth services. Generally these services are handled at the local level. The Service is not a mandated service and can provide immediate savings to the County if eliminated. Net of in direct aid, transferring youth services to the local level is estimated to yield a cost reduction of approximately \$5.5 million.		
	HUMAN SERVICES – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
Merger of Human Services and Health	Fiscal 2018	\$660,450	
Based upon the recent actions of surrounding other State counties, the merger of Human Services and Health has been deemed possible. Such a merger would allow for the elimination of duplicative functions. As such, the estimated reduction assumes the elimination of 9 administrative positions plus an ordinance position (physician).			
TOTAL REDUCTIONS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES:		\$6,160,450	

POLICE	POLICE – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
		Privatize Ambulance Services And Issuance of RFP to Determine Value	Immediate
	<p>CMA believes that there could be material cost savings if Nassau contracted out the ambulance function. However, a detailed analysis is beyond the scope of the Report would be required. As such, the savings reflect the salary and fringe of 153 medical technicians. Not accounted for in the reduction estimate is overtime reductions due to the redeployment of any sworn personnel.</p> <p>** The reduction estimate does not account for the value of the Ambulance Bureau which is likely significant. Additional analysis would be requires to properly appraise the Bureau. As such, CMA would recommend the County issue an RFP to further investigate the potential value of the bureau.</p>		
	POLICE – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination Of Crossing Guards	Immediate	\$14,476,496
	<p>The Administrative Code of the County indicates that school crossing guards <u>may</u> be appointed by the Commissioner of Police. As such, there is no mandate that the County continue to fund crossing guards. Defunding the crossing guards would put the onus onto divisions of local government within the County to take responsibility of staffing the positions. Further legal analysis will be required.</p>		

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

POLICE	POLICE – INITIATIVE #3	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Closure of Marine Bureau	Immediate or Fiscal 2018	\$3,942,099
	<p>The Marine Bureau conducts police patrols of 225 square miles of marine district waterways on both the north shore and south shore of Nassau County. The bureau has many roles and responsibilities. Some responsibilities fall solely upon the bureau while others are shared or overlap with outside agencies and entities located within the County. Each of the Towns within the County utilizes harbor or marine enforcement divisions which, along with the Coast Guard, can sufficiently patrol the County's waters. The Department's Marine Bureau had operational expenses of approximately \$6 million in fiscal 2016. The County could realize savings of approximately \$4 million by closing the unit and redeploying the officers elsewhere to reduce overtime. The bureau is not a mandated service and can provide immediate savings to the County if eliminated.</p>		
	POLICE – INITIATIVE #4	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Closure of Mounted Unit	Immediate or Fiscal 2018	\$584,427
	<p>The Mounted Unit division in the Department is primarily used for crowd control and security during public events. Additional Public Safety officers would be able to provide the same level of security at a far lower expense given the high costs of housing and maintenance associated with horses. The savings estimate does not include the Mounted Unit's usage in the County's Highway Bureau as those costs were unable to be determined. The unit is not a mandated service.</p>		
	POLICE – INITIATIVE #5	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Consolidation of IT Function	N/A	\$500,000
	<p>The consolidation includes the elimination or redeployment of 10 positions with the remainder transferred to IT. Savings are based on elimination of duplicative functions and overtime reductions through the redeployment of sworn personnel.</p>		
	TOTAL REDUCTIONS POLICE DEPARTMENT:		\$35,003,022

PARKS	PARKS – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Transfer or Elimination of Park Maintenance & Reduce Seasonal Employees	Fiscal 2018	\$5,608,404
	<p>Parks believes that maintenance could be pushed to the town level on various parks via inter-municipal agreements. General Municipal Law permits the County to enter into such agreements with towns, village and cities and could include the transfer of operational control. However, such agreements are not believed to be mandatory. As such, the County cannot compel local governments to assume control. All involved parties be required to reach a mutual agreement. An agreement of this type does not require the transfer of title. Furthermore, previous County administrations have been successful in reaching agreements relating to park properties. However, no documentation relating to such agreements was available for review.</p> <p>CMA believes the County should actively seek agreements with local governments with respect to the control of a number of park properties. If County efforts do not yield positive results, the park properties in question should be considered for suspension or closure. Additional legal analysis would be required with respect to the closure of parkland.</p> <p>With a reduction to managed properties, it is reasonable to believe that staffing levels could be reduced. The Parks Department has utilized a large amount of seasonal employees in recent years. With reduced needs, such workers could simply be reduced or not hired.</p> <p>The following parks are deemed to be reasonable for transfer: Silver Lake, Lofts, Milburn, Saddle Rock, Cedarmere, and Grant Park.</p>		
	PARKS – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
Privatize County Operated Museums	Immediate or Fiscal 2018	\$860,000	
<p>Museums are discretionary and could be spun-off into a 501(c)(3) organization. Four County run museums for 2016 equated to a net loss of approximately \$860,000 according to the Parks Department. Other museums receiving a County subsidy, are subsidized from hotel taxes, which must be spent or lost. Thus, it would not make sense to discontinue the subsidy.</p>			

PARKS	PARKS – INITIATIVE #3	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Close or Privatize Ice Rink	Immediate or Fiscal 2018	To Be Determined
	<p>Closing or selling the Cantiague Park Ice Rink will eliminate the high maintenance costs associated with the rink as well as employees required to man the facility. Despite several attempts, the County was unable to segregate utility costs associated with the ice rink. As such, the reduction was deemed reasonable based on CMA’s cost estimates.</p>		
TOTAL REDUCTIONS PARKS, RECREATION & MUSEUMS:		\$6,468,404	

PUBLIC WORKS	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Across the Board Highway Cuts	Immediate & Fiscal 2018	Estimates at \$5,000,000
	<p>Benchmarked against Suffolk County, highway costs are exceptionally high (\$34 per capita for Nassau versus \$20 for Suffolk). Since both counties manage approximately 2,000 lane miles, it would be reasonable to assume that these costs could be brought more inline. The County’s per capital include all roadways, drainage, and traffic signal projects. For 2015, the total cost of these projects in was approximately \$45.5M, according to County officials, with offsetting State aid of \$11 million. Although, the costs associated with certain projects is offset by from State aid, Suffolk County likely benefits from the same types of State aid. As such, the benefitting aid is not believed to be relevant with respect to the proposed cost reductions.</p> <p>If the County’s per capita costs were equal to those of Suffolk County, the savings would be in the range of \$16.8 million. An analysis beyond the scope of the Report would be required to determine what factors, if any, could not be reduced. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this analysis a cost reduction of \$5 million was deemed reasonable. The estimate is based on an 11% reduction of project costs indicated by County officials.</p>		

PUBLIC WORKS	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Utilization of Energy Consultant	Immediate	\$600,000
	<p>The County needs to actively monitor utility bills for accuracy and possible savings by entering into load shedding agreements with PSE & G LI. In addition, phone and data lines should be reviewed to determine if the County is paying for unused capacity. With the reduction of employees over the past several years there should have been a reduction in communication and other costs. The reduction estimate is net of consulting fees and is based on savings believed to have been realized by Suffolk County through use of a similar type of consultant.</p>		
	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #3	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Fuel and Maintenance Savings	Immediate & Fiscal 2018	\$594,000
	<p>With the reduction in the size of the County’s fleet, fuel usage and maintenance costs would be impacted. The estimate assumes a reduction of 330 vehicles.</p>		
	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #4	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Shared Service Agreement For Quality Control Function	Fiscal 2018	\$407,000
	<p>The quality control testing lab primarily analyzes materials such as asphalt and concrete to ensure bid specifications have been met. CMA believes the County should seek an inter-municipal agreement with Suffolk County relating to the quality control laboratory. Suffolk County’s lab is located in Yaphank. A reasonable cost reduction for such an agreement would be 50% of the amount included in the 2017 budget.</p>		

PUBLIC WORKS	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #5	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Tank Testing Repair	Immediate	\$400,000
	<p>Tank testing and repair was deemed a service duplicated by multiple departments within the County, including Public Works and the Health Department. As such, the estimated reduction assumes a reasonable 50% reduction based on the amount budgeted for 2017.</p>		
	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #6	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Tighter Policies And Procedures Relative To Take-Home Vehicles	Immediate	\$250,000
	<p>The County has indicated the usage of take-home vehicles have been negotiated into various collective bargaining agreements. Even if the assignment of a vehicle was determined to be a precondition of employment this does not trump policy and procedures that may be in place for the use of the vehicles. Tighter policies and procedures relating to the vehicle usage will impact usage. For example, vehicles could be branded with several County seals, making them less attractive to drive. Policies should strictly address private purpose usage and vehicles should also be carefully monitored. Violating a policy could be grounds for the employee to lose the vehicle. The reduction estimate is based on the reduced usage of take-home vehicles. Although not quantified, potential risk for liability would also be greatly reduced.</p>		
	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #7	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination Of Asbestos Project Manager	Immediate	\$113,100
	<p>All asbestos abatement must services be performed by licensed professionals. A project manager would be a redundant function. The reduction estimate assumes the elimination of 1 position including fringe benefits.</p>		

PUBLIC WORKS	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #8	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Bridge Maintenance Staff Reductions	Immediate & Fiscal 2018	Not Quantifiable At Present
	<p>Nassau has approximately half the number of fixed and bascule bridges as compared to Suffolk County, yet the budget shows a staff of 126 compared to 10 in Suffolk County. The staffing for this function is as presented in the budget is and misleading. According to County officials, Bridge Maintenance also includes the majority of road maintenance operations. County staff under this section can perform all road maintenance functions including, but not limited to, filling potholes, cutting grass, debris removal, and small scale paving and construction projects. Although believed to be a reducible area, an estimate could not be quantified due to the current presentation of information.</p>		
	PUBLIC WORKS – INITIATIVE #9	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Drafting Division Reduction	N/A	Not Quantifiable At Present
	<p>Similar to the Bridge Maintenance Staff, staffing levels in the budget appeared to be excessive or inaccurate. For 2017, the budget included an increase of 5 fulltime Drafting staff to a total of 41. According to County officials, the Drafting Division is historically used for civil site construction. The division oversees the construction of many of the Department’s large scale construction projects, including, but not limited to, road resurfacing, drainage, and bridge repair. During 2016 the County lost a union grievance which required the County to hire additional construction inspector trainees. Six of these individuals were assigned to the drafting division. Although believed to be a reducible area, an estimate could not be quantified due to the current presentation of information.</p>		
TOTAL REDUCTIONS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS:		\$7,364,100	

SOCIAL SERVICES	SOCIAL SERVICES – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Reduce Day Care	Immediate & Fiscal 2018	\$1,200,000
	Reduce day care eligibility from 200% of the federal poverty level to 185%. Using 2016 caseload data, 735 families, or 14%, of all day care cases (active and inactive) earned between 186% and 200% of the federal poverty level. If eligibility was reduced to 185%, the Department estimates it could potentially save up to \$1.6 million, net of reimbursements and state aid. If the rate was further reduced to 150% of the federal poverty level, the level at which Suffolk County operates, it would affect 1,850 families, or 34% of the caseload, which could potentially save up to \$4.2 million, net of reimbursements and state aid.		
	SOCIAL SERVICES – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Reduction of Day Care Staff	Immediate	* See Turnover Analysis
	Staff reduction to match reduced services levels.		
	TOTAL REDUCTIONS		
	DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES:		\$1,200,000

TREASURER	TREASURER – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination of All Physical Payroll Checks	Immediate	\$1,205,157
	Require usage of E-Send as the default method of distribution. The reduction is based on banking industry standards relating to costs per check. County officials disagreed with potential savings, however since based on industry standards CMA deemed them to be reasonable.		

TREASURER	TREASURER – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination of Vendor Checks Through P-Cards	Immediate	\$183,000
	Require usage of P-Cards. The reduction is based on banking industry standards relating to costs per check. County officials disagreed with potential savings, however since based on industry standards CMA deemed them to be reasonable.		
	TREASURER – INITIATIVE #3	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination of Physical Medicare Checks	Immediate	\$63,720
	Require usage of E-Send. The reduction is based on banking industry standards relating to costs per check. County officials disagreed with potential savings, however since based on industry standards CMA deemed them to be reasonable.		
TOTAL REDUCTIONS COUNTY TREASURER:		\$1,451,877	

OTHER	OTHER – INITIATIVE #1	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Hiring Freeze (2018)	Fiscal 2018	\$15,000,000
	Turnover savings from strict hiring freeze, which allows only the replacement of essential new County Executive administrative staff.		

OTHER	OTHER – INITIATIVE #2	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Legislature Staff Reduction	Immediate & Fiscal 2018	\$2,696,614
	<p>Reductions through re-organization and centralization of services. Duplicative operations between majority and minority groups. Nassau has a NYS legislative look - there is budget for the majority and a budget for the minority. Within those budgets are duplicative public relations / communications, legal and financial positions. Based on a benchmark analysis against the structure of Suffolk County’s legislative staff, CMA recognized a total 21 non-essential positions which could be eliminated. The reduction estimate includes the salaries and estimated fringe benefits for these positions.</p>		
	OTHER – INITIATIVE #3	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Development of Countywide Clerical Pool	N/A	\$1,625,000
	<p>CMA believes that there could be material (but indeterminate) cost savings if Nassau created an employee pool with generic titles that could be transferred between departments to meet peak work load requirements and reduce overtime or maximize revenue generation. The estimated reduction is based on the creation of a 25 person pool which would reduce overtime and backlogs.</p>		
	OTHER – INITIATIVE #4	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination of Office of Minority Affairs	Immediate	\$962,993
	<p>The Division is not a mandated service and can provide immediate savings to the County if transferred to the local level or eliminated. Additional legal analysis would be required.</p>		

OTHER	OTHER – INITIATIVE #5	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Elimination of Veterans Service Agency	Immediate	\$660,050
	The Agency is not a mandated service and can provide immediate savings to the County if transferred to the local level or eliminated. Additional legal analysis would be required.		
	OTHER – INITIATIVE #6	TIMEFRAME	ESTIMATED REDUCTION
	Board of Elections Across the Board Cuts	Immediate	\$600,000
	Reduction of budget by \$600,000. Based on conversations with County, budget had been increased due to elections. Reasonable cuts without impacting services.		
TOTAL REDUCTIONS OTHER:		\$21,544,657	
TOTAL REDUCTIONS ALL INITIATIVES:		\$87,734,880	

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

TURNOVER SAVINGS ANALYSIS

Turnover savings results from two factors, keeping a position vacant for a period of time before it is refilled and filling a position at a lower salary than that budgeted.

The below summary of W-2 data from 2016 for fulltime employees (no part-time or seasonal) has been provided by the Office of Management and Budget.

General Fund- Fulltime New Hires		
	2015	2016
Salary Paid During Year Of Hire	\$8,144,703	\$4,467,308
Annualized Salary	9,324,585	9,353,259
Total Count Of New Employees	199	190
General Fund, Termination payments in 2016		
Employee Count For Termination Payments		505
Termination Payment In 2016		8,145,916
Total Payments Made In 2016		10,218,327
Salary & Other Payments Made 2016 (Total Payments Less Termination Payments)		2,072,411
Annualized Budgeted Salary For Employees Which Separated From Service		41,440,494
Turnover savings (budgeted salaries less termination pay)		\$31,222,167

The following assumptions were drawn from the W2 data:

- Total new hires for 2015 and 2016 were generally aligned
- Annualized salary of the new hires was also comparable for 2015 and 2016, at approximately \$9.3 million
- During 2016, a total of 505 General Fund fulltime employees were paid termination pay amounting to \$8.1 million (see following detail), total remuneration for these employees was \$10.2 million, including termination pay. However, it is believed that the information may have been somewhat skewed based on the W2 data that was provided since termination pay is sometimes spread over multiple years. As such, the calculation for savings was adjusted accordingly. Actual terminations for 2016 are believed to be approximately 300 employees.
- Based on the initial amount of 505 employees, annualized salary costs for such individuals was approximately \$41.4 million.

- The difference between total remuneration actually paid vs. salaries budgeted was \$31.2 million of turnover savings (without adjustment for the loss of offsetting state and federal aid).

Therefore, at 505 employees, based on the above assumption, during 2016 a total hiring freeze in the General Fund would have resulted in turnover savings of approximately \$40.5 million. This would have been generated by \$9.3 million in savings from the annualized salary of the new hires and \$31.2 million from turnover savings.

As result of the upcoming elections, 2018 will likely result in higher turnover and higher termination costs. With the change in administration most of terminations will likely occur at the beginning of the year meaning that the amount paid in regular salary prior to termination will be less than normal.

It is reasonable to assume that if NIFA were to impose a fairly strict hiring freeze in 2018 (allowing for replacement of essential new County Executive administrative staff) savings in the range of \$15 to \$20 million from salary related costs could be achievable in the General Fund. For the purpose of the recommendation, a conservative estimate of \$15 million was utilized.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

SECTION III – EFFICIENCY COST SAVINGS STRATEGIES

This section focuses on efficiency strategies that will help to mitigate potential setbacks resulting from the cost reductions described throughout the Report. A particular emphasis is placed on Shared Services and Information Technology.

SHARED SERVICES

The prolonged economic recession has been detrimental to the County's fiscal health. With several primary revenue sources, such as sales tax, being extremely susceptible to fluctuations in the economic environment, it comes as no surprise that the County has suffered. To mitigate losses, many jurisdictions have started to explore ways to eliminate duplicative services through the use of shared service agreements. In fact, New York State has been proactive in offering support for such investigations. In addition, the State's 2018 budget included a mandate requiring each County meet with local governments, develop a shared services plan and submit the plan for the States review in the Fall of 2017. Shared services and the State's programs are further discussed below.

Internal Opportunities

Although the County should certainly explore shared service opportunities with other local governments, the results of our analysis show that there may be internal opportunities to reduce redundancies and reduce costs. Of these opportunities, the development of a clerical pool may prove to be the most significant. Such a pool would assist the Departments in meeting peak workload requirements, reduce overtime and enhance revenue generation.

A major impediment to cost effective delivery of governmental services is the inability of government to reassign staff between departments to meet changing needs. This problem consists of two primary components. Foremost, employees often work in narrowly defined job titles that preclude them from performing outside tasks. Secondly, employees are limited to work in a specific department or unit. It is very difficult to transfer them between departments to meet changing work-load or programmatic requirements.

During its analysis, CMA found that administrative functions in several Departments, including the Police Department and Fire Commission, were handled by specialized staff. Not only does this result in an inefficient workflow, but it results in significant, unnecessary costs.

The structure of the County government includes a Shared Service Department, which is responsible for the procurement of materials, supplies, equipment and services for other County Departments. Despite its potential, the Department has not been effective. Nevertheless, it would be positioned within the County to house a clerical pool. Applicable functions to include would be those that are uniform and serviceable across all County departments, such as general administration, human resources and accounting.

As an example, for several years, Suffolk County has utilized a small but effective clerical pool through its Civil Service Department. On occasion, Suffolk will utilize specialty staff, such as

grant writers, across various departments. CMA believes that there could be material (but as of yet indeterminate) cost savings if the County created an employee pool with generic titles that could be transferred between departments.

External Opportunities

There are numerous State laws authorizing collaboration between jurisdictions. In fact, General Municipal Law Article 5-G provides wide-ranging authority for entities to investigate such activities. The types of joint projects that have been investigated are well documented by the state through its Local Government Services Division. The Division includes case studies of previous projects, information on applicable state funding to offset costs and various other resources. In addition to the Local Government Services Division, the Office of the State Comptroller and the New York State Attorney General's Office can provide technical and legal assistance as it relates to the investigation of shared services. Given the complex collective bargaining agreements and unique tax laws surrounding the County, the County should take advantage of State resources when considering functions for shared services.

The following list provides governmental functions that are commonly considered for shared service opportunities amongst local governments, which we believe could reasonably be further investigated by the County:

Administrative Functions

- Accounting Functions (Staff, Payroll Processing, Software)
- Administrative Services (Clerical Support, Data Entry, Janitorial Services)
- Investment Of Funds
- Records Management
- Research And Analysis
- Training And Education
- Utility Services

Human Capital Management

- Health Insurance
- Human Resources/Personnel (Employee Benefits Management)
- Professional Services (Engineering, Architectural, Legal Services)

General Operations

- Equipment Sharing
- Facilities Maintenance (Buildings, Grounds)
- Fuel Facilities – Cooperative Fuel Agreements
- Storage Facilities (Vehicle, Salt, Etc.)

IT Functions

- IT Administration And Training Through The County
- IT Security Management
- County Developed IT Applications (B-Prep)

Infrastructure

- Parks Locations
- Park Maintenance
- Physical Building Sharing (Municipal Buildings)

Public Safety Services

- Emergency Management And Dispatch
- Fire Marshal Inspections And Town Building Inspections
- Jail Facilities, Including The Juvenile Detention Center
- Various Police Services
- Crossing Guards (If Not Defunded)

Constituent Services

- Senior Programs
- Youth Programs

Miscellaneous Services

- Museums (If Not Privatized)
- Tourism
- Various Roadways

Source: New York State Division of Local Government and School Accountability.

The timing constraints of the Report do not allow for the development of a full savings analysis relating to each of the above functions. Although we believe the list provides a baseline for areas to be studied, additional analysis to quantify the level of savings would be required.

New York State County-Wide Shared Services Initiative

The State's enacted 2018 budget included a mandate establishing the County-Wide Shared Services Initiative (the "Initiative"). The initiative is intended to generate property tax savings by facilitating operational collaboration between jurisdictions.

Through the initiative, each county must establish a Shared Services Panel ("SSP") that will manage the development of an intergovernmental cooperation and shared services plan. Each plan must include actions which can be implemented during the subsequent calendar year, 2018 for the purposes of the County. In addition, the plans must demonstrate collaboration with the various local governments. The State has highlighted the following key areas for inclusion in each plan:

- Elimination Of Duplicative Services
- Shared Services
- The Reduction Of Back-Office Administrative Overhead
- Improved Coordination Of Services

Although the State will provide technical assistance, no form of monetary support is being provided to offset costs associated with the development of each plan. Nevertheless, for plans

finalized in 2017, the State may provide a one-time grant during 2018 to assist with the implementation of initiatives included in the plan. Similarly, for entities which submit plans during 2018, the State may award a one-time grant during 2019 to assist with implementation efforts.

CMA has confirmed that the County is actively working on the development of a shared services plan. However, a list of tentative services being reviewed by the County was not available as of the date of the Report. Nevertheless, the State has tentatively requested each county to provide its plan by September 15, 2017. As such, in the near future the County should reasonably be able to provide a preliminary list of functions being considered during the summer of 2017.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Technology at the County level was found to be antiquated and often fragmented across various departments. Nevertheless, the Information Technology (“IT”) Department was found to be well qualified and capable of developing and implementing in-house applications which would likely have a significant impact on efficiency. Despite the capabilities of the IT Department, many County departments have averted efforts to implement such technologies. As a result, several cost savings opportunities have been lost. As such, several technology related improvements were identified, which, if implemented, could have a material positive impact on the County’s expenses. However, since the improvements themselves are not current expenditures, but rather efficiencies that could yield prompt cost reductions, they are discussed separately in the form of efficiency cost savings strategies to counterbalance the effects of the identified reductions.

According to Gartner, Inc., a research and advisory firm specializing in IT services, projects optimizing technologies can effectively reduce certain costs by up to 50%. Furthermore, Forrester, Inc., another IT research and advisory firm, suggests that technology can be utilized to automate redundant workflow tasks. Automation is projected to reduce the time spent on those tasks by upwards of 60%, with an additional 20% reduction in the time taken to manage and support those tasks. These potential efficiencies are considered significant to the County for 2 reasons. Foremost, considering the recommended cost reductions and hiring freeze, the County will need to find ways to do more with fewer resources and staff. By automating certain functions, it is reasonable to assume the workforce will be better able to focus its efforts, mitigating the effects of decreased staffing levels. Secondly, improved efficiency levels will likely impact, perhaps significantly, the usage of overtime. As an example, Social Services is one department that has worked in cooperation with the IT Department. Together, the departments were able to mobilize a portion of its workforce with iPads that permitted employees to complete certain functions while in the field. The time savings correlating to the mobilization was estimated at 25%, which equates to annual savings of \$3.3 million. Other recent cost saving initiatives of the IT Department are described below.

- Phone System Modernization (Near Completion)
 - 5,000 Users, 20% Land-Line Savings Estimated
 - Estimated Annual Savings: \$1.0 Million

- Electronic Contracting Routing System (Implemented)
 - 165 Current Users, 20% Estimated Time Savings
 - Estimated Annual Savings: \$3.0 Million

- B-PREP Electronic Budgeting System
 - 148 Current Users, 20% Estimated Time Savings
 - Estimated Annual Savings: \$2.6 Million

By focusing on the implementation of technology, the operational workflow of the County can be greatly influenced and costs can be further lowered. Although past efforts have not been successful, mandating departments to implement such technologies would be advantageous. Requiring such actions may also impact the estimated savings correlating to the turnover analysis that was completed for the Report. The County workforce is rapidly aging and may be avoidant to the adoption of new technologies. If required, it is possible an increase in retirements could occur.

Unlike many other local governments, the County's IT Department possesses the skill to develop in-house applications. Alone, this will result in significant cost avoidance with respect to software purchases. However, this also would bode well for shared service considerations. Associated development and implementation costs for shared projects may benefit if spread across multiple jurisdictions. The County is well situated to lead such an initiative.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

SECTION IV – COUNTY OPERATIONS – KEY DEPARTMENTS AND FINDINGS

SUMMARY

Determining the cost reduction initiatives for the County required CMA to independently interview specific departments within the County in order to better understand their respective operations. This section provides a summary of the interviews.

DEPARTMENT OF ASSESSMENT

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Department of Assessment are as follows:

Department Vision: Ensure that the assessments of property in Nassau County are fair and equitable.

Department Mission: Develop accurate assessments for properties within Nassau County and properly administer New York State Real Property Tax Exemptions

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 127)

Department Overview

- The Department's responsibilities include the development of fair and equitable assessments for all commercial and residential properties in Nassau County
- Accurately process New York State Property Tax Exemption applications filed
- Continue to develop and make the assessment process as efficient as possible
- Improve public awareness and understanding of the role that the assessment process plays in determining property taxes in Nassau County
- Analyze and manage all building permit data submitted by the Towns and Villages

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Approximately 135 budgeted employees
- The Department has 8 fewer budgeted positions as compared to the 2016 Adopted Budget
- Employee salaries, wages and fees increased 8.2% from the 2016 projection of \$8.9 million to \$9.6 million

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- The implementation of the Residential and Commercial Property Assessment Grievance Negotiation and Settlement program is now yielding millions of dollars in savings for the County
- New York State legislation signed by the Governor in November 2014, created a Disputed Assessment Fund which saves the county \$950 million in debt service payments over 20 years

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Incredible amount of uncertainty going forward regarding healthcare
- Department estimates approximately 40% of employees are eligible for retirement

COUNTY ATTORNEY

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the County Attorney are as follows:

Department Vision: The County Attorney's Office strives to safeguard the interests of our residents and to advance the County's initiatives through litigation, negotiation, and legislation.

Department Mission: The County Attorney's Office is committed to providing effective representation and legal advice to the County's Administration, Departments, Agencies, and Legislature.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 130)

Department Overview

The County Attorney's Office is comprised of seven Legal Bureaus, and the Administration Unit that coordinates and supervises the activities of the bureaus.

- Administration Unit
 - This Unit is comprised of the County Attorney's legal management team working together with personnel, budget, and payroll. The Unit oversees the functioning of each bureau of the Office and actively participates in the pre and post-trial litigation. The Unit also includes the Special Investigations Unit, which investigates Workers' Compensation claims, selected tort claims, and waste, fraud, and abuse allegations related to County employees and property, including workplace violence investigations.
- Family Court Bureau
 - This Bureau represents the Department of Social Services in child abuse and neglect actions, enforces child support orders on behalf of out-of-state custodial

parents and their children, and investigates and prosecutes juveniles (age 15 and younger) who the police have arrested for crimes.

- Litigation Bureau
 - This Bureau handles State and Federal litigation, including civil rights and employment discrimination cases, commercial and environmental matters, as well as discrimination claims before local human rights tribunals. The Bureau also works closely with the Office of Labor Relations to defend grievances and union arbitrations. In addition, the Bureau represents the County in personal injury cases from routine slip-and-fall matters to complex road design cases. Litigation has also assumed control of the former Vehicle Forfeitures Bureau.
- Municipal Finance Bureau
 - This Bureau handles all finance matters for the County including the issuance of debt by the County or related entities such as the Nassau County Sewer and Storm Water Finance Authority. The Bureau also advises County officials on all financing issues and works closely with outside Bond Counsel.
- Municipal Transactions Bureau
 - This Bureau represents the County on contractual matters including real estate, procurement of goods and services, concessions, and inter-municipal agreements.
- Appeals and Opinions Bureau
 - This Bureau drafts and comments on State and local legislation, and advises on implementation of State and local laws and initiatives. The Bureau also provides legal opinions to the County Executive and his staff and all departments of the County on such matters as the County's Code of Ethics, the Freedom of Information Law, and privacy and confidential issues such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. The Bureau also handles the appellate work for all other litigating bureaus in the Office including administrative appeals as well as in State and Federal courts.
- Tax Certiorari and Condemnation Bureau
 - This Bureau handles real property tax review cases known as Article 7 proceedings for commercial and residential properties. It also represents the County in Supreme Court, on matters including tax exemptions and corrections of errors. The Bureau also handles all condemnation proceedings and acquisitions of property on behalf of the County.
- Claims Management Bureau
 - This Bureau settles small property claims, investigates cases on behalf of all the litigating bureaus, and focuses on the early settlement of claims and risk management. The Bureau also pursues claims on behalf of the County and/or its agencies for damage to County property, facilities, and/or personnel.

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Currently employs 55 deputy county attorneys
- 5 budgeted vacancies for Department

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Department has cut costs by approximately \$2 million since last administration by utilizing special counsel on contract basis
- No backlog with regards to general litigation cases

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Department believes work load is at capacity
- Backlog of tax certs

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Office of Consumer Affairs are as follows:

Department Vision: In partnership with the citizens and businesses of Nassau County, as well as Federal, State, and local enforcement agencies, the Office of Consumer Affairs seeks to eliminate fraudulent business practices, protect the County and its citizens, strengthen the County's economic base, generate community and business trust, expand community outreach, and enhance the quality of life in Nassau County.

Department Mission: The Office of Consumer Affairs strives to protect consumers and businesses from fraudulent enterprises and business practices, enhance consumer safety, strictly enforce consumer legislation, support competitive business practices, improve internal service delivery, provide consumer education and information, and strengthen the consumer voice.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 144)

Department Overview

The Office of Consumer Affairs has five responsibility centers.

- Consumer Protection
 - The Commissioner's Office manages and monitors the Office's operations, gives guidance to the office staff, supports investigative activities, carries out civil remedies and penalties, and pursues criminal prosecution through the District Attorney's office.
- Weights and Measures
 - Mandated by New York State Agriculture and Market Laws, the goal of the Weights and Measures Division is to ensure accuracy in weighing and measuring devices, gas pumps, price scanners, and other equipment by testing and performing inspections.

- Investigations, Complaints, and Enforcement
 - The Investigations, Complaints and Enforcement Division reviews, investigates, mediates, and resolves consumer complaints. Consumer Affairs enforces over twenty-seven consumer protection and licensing laws that regulate business establishments in Nassau County. The Division protects consumers from unfair, deceptive, and unconscionable trade practices. If a violation of the law occurs, the Division conducts a hearing with the business.
- Licensing
 - The Licensing Division accepts and reviews applications for businesses that the law requires be licensed. This Division is responsible for ensuring that applicants have the requisite experience, required insurance, and financial stability and are of good moral character. Some of these businesses include:
 - Home Improvement Contractors
 - Second-Hand Precious Metal and Gem Dealers
 - Scrap Metal Processors, Vehicle Dismantlers, and Junk Dealers
 - Dry Cleaners and Laundromats
 - Storage Warehouses
 - Home Service Contractors
 - Electronics or Home Appliance Repair Dealers
 - Environmental Hazard Remediation Providers and Technicians
 - ATM Machines
 - Pet Stores and Pet Dealers
- Information and Education
 - This Division develops and conducts consumer awareness programs for schools and community groups in addition to developing and distributing consumer education booklets and brochures. As mandated by the New York State Freedom of Information Law, this Division responds to inquiries regarding the historical recording of complaints made against a vendor.

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Department currently has 25 employees
 - Department considers 45-50 would be optimal
- 3 out of 5 inspectors are expected to retire at year-end

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Revenue generating department

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Item pricing waiver exemption requires two separate inspections
 - Don't have staff to take all inspections

- Inspector specification are outdated with regards to civil service test
- Technology not useful, most of the time is spent interacting with people
- Department building not being utilized properly
 - Former office space is now used for County Autoseum

SHERIFF/CORRECTIONAL CENTER

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Sheriff's Department/Correctional Center are as follows:

Department Vision: The Office of the Sheriff seeks to maintain operational and fiscal accountability relating to the care and control of inmates and ensure the swift execution of Family Court orders by the Enforcement Division.

Department Mission: The Office of the Sheriff comprises two distinct divisions: the Corrections Division and the Enforcement Division. The Corrections Division seeks to provide a safe and secure environment for the staff and inmates, while providing for the care and custody of detainees and prisoners committed to its custody by the judiciary. In this regard, the Department is required to comply with all laws, specifically correction law, oversight agencies, specifically the New York State Commission of Correction, existing consent decrees, and Court mandates. The Enforcement Division carries out the orders of the New York State courts, including the discovery and seizure of property, the execution of warrants, and the enforcement of evictions.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 151)

Department Overview

The Office is comprised of two divisions. The Enforcement Division, which consists of four individual units, and the Corrections Division, which is made up of six individual units, all of which are further detailed below.

- **Enforcement Division**
 - *Central Office* – The main responsibilities of the Office include the supervision of various court orders, such as financial judgments, warrants of arrest, orders of attachment, revenue executions, summonses, and warrants of eviction. The Central Office also oversees the sale of confiscated property at public auctions.
 - *Family Court Unit* – Enforces security of the detention areas of Family Court. The Unit also issues summonses and arrest warrants to individuals located within both Nassau and Suffolk Counties and also the five boroughs of New York City.
 - *Field Unit* – Administer and carry out various court orders received in the Civil Enforcement Central Office and orders issued by the County Attorney's Office, the Department of Human Services and the Office of Consumer Affairs.
 - *SLAP/Warrants ("Sheriff's Location Of Assets Program")* – This Unit responsible for the investigation of cases referred by DSS to search out the assets of parents who fail to provide mandatory child support payments and preparing cases that DSS present in Family Court.

- **Correctional Division**

- *Budget and Finance* – Main duties include the management of fiscal operations, such as procurements and maintenance of the Office’s budget and inmate accounts.
- *Human Resources* – Responsible for all payroll and personnel matters such as staffing, training, attendance, medical compliance, and the Employee Assistance Program.
- *Legal/Investigations Unit* – Comprised of Internal Affairs, Legal Affairs, Criminal Investigations, Canine, Gang Intelligence, Policy and Procedures, Inmate Discipline, and Compliance Units.
- *Support Services* – Responsible for capital projects, food services, maintenance, fleet service, central supply, environmental and fire safety compliance, and building facilities and grounds.
- *Security Services* – Responsible for the supervision of all inmates committed to the custody of the Sheriff, including the processing of newly admitted/discharging inmates. The classifying, transporting and housing of inmates. Inmate visits, inmate property, inmate grievances, and the operation of the Identification Unit.
- *Rehabilitation Unit* – Responsible for administering the following programs: Prison Industries, High School Education Program, Inmate Council, Inmate Library, Religious Services, Community Re-Entry Programs, Vocational Programs, Drug and Alcohol Programs, Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) Programs, and remedial reading services. Additionally, the staff is responsible for the Computer Operations and Communications Units.

Workforce

In-person interviews of key personnel of the Department have been conducted. During the interviews, several topics were discussed, including staffing. Together with data obtained from financial documents, below is a list of findings relative to the Department’s workforce.

- Approximately 1,040 budgeted employees;
- Salaries Wages & Fees in the 2017 Adopted Budget are \$115.3 million, which is a 0.6% increase from the 2016 Projection

OFFICE OF CONSTITUENT AFFAIRS

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Office of Constituent Affairs are as follows:

Department Vision: The Office of Constituent Affairs strives to provide superior constituent services connecting citizens with the wide array of County services they seek.

Department Mission: The Office of Constituent Affairs acts as a liaison by providing communications and outreach between various County departments and citizens, news media, and other stakeholders in Nassau County.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 160)

Department Overview

The primary function of the Office of Constituent Affairs is to support County operations.

- County receives over 80,000 constituent inquiries annually through mail, phone, email, walk-ins, and petitions.
- Responsible for addressing, directing, and formulating responses to constituent issues
- Responsible, through the Press Office, for informing the public of the various County policies, programs, and actions through relationships with various media outlets
- Printing and Graphics
 - Oversees all of the County's printing facilities, providing in-house photo-offset printed media to the departments and divisions within Nassau County.
 - Responsible for providing all multifunction printing equipment and supplies Countywide.
 - Overseeing all copier equipment purchases as well as the maintenance of this equipment.
- Central Mailroom (Bureau of Mail)
 - Manages the majority of the County's mail facilities

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Approximately 35 employees in Department
- No need for seasonal employees

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Healthcare agreed upon to 2020
- Social media account could help eliminate mail pieces and printing

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Department of shared services
 - Non-functional and in need of an implementation plan
 - Target joint/bulk purchasing

FIRE COMMISSION

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Fire Commission are as follows:

Department Vision: The Nassau County Fire Commission strives to ensure that Nassau County continues to be one of the safest counties in the country in which to live, work, visit, and do business.

Department Mission: Through public fire safety education, efficient fire communications, state-of-the-art, fully-equipped, hazardous materials response teams, knowledgeable and dedicated Emergency Medical Academy Staff, and aggressive inspection programs, the Nassau County Fire Commission seeks to protect the residents of Nassau County and to assist the seventy-one County fire departments by providing highly efficient and cost-effective fire safety services. The Nassau County Fire Commission seeks to help promote economic development in Nassau County by keeping construction projects on track and on time, through expert plan examination, code and ordinance review, meetings and consultations, and fire and life safety system testing.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 194)

Department Overview

The Fire Commission is comprised of three agencies and five divisions, which are further detailed below.

- Nassau County Fire Marshal’s Office
 - *Fire Investigation Division* – Responsible for fire investigations within County limits
 - *Industrial Inspections Division* – Inspects all industrial occupancy within the County
 - *Hazardous Material Division* – Responds to emergencies involving hazardous substances
 - *General Inspection Division* – Inspects all public assembly occupancies within County limits
 - *Special Facilities Unit* – Part of the General Inspection Division, inspects and promotes fire safety within general and mental health related facilities, correctional facilities and public and private schools
 - *Permit Division* – Issues fire alarm and tent permits to County businesses and residents
- Fire Communication Division (Bureau of Fire and Rescue Services)
 - The Fire Communications Division provides dispatching services to forty-one County fire departments, four volunteer ambulance corps and back-up dispatching to an additional twenty-two fire departments.
- Fire-Police Emergency Medical Services (“EMS”) Academy
 - The EMS Academy provides year-round training and educational services to County EMS providers.

Workforce

In-person interviews of key personnel of the Fire Commission have been conducted. During the interviews several topics were discussed, including staffing. Together with data obtained from financial documents, below is a list of findings relative to the Fire Commission’s workforce.

- Particularly low turnover;
- Workforce is aging with no succession plans;
- Low salaries, by comparison to other public safety divisions;
- Employees are classified incorrectly, which leads to excessive out of class pay;
- Little clerical support, leading to an inefficient workflow in which higher paid staff must complete administrative tasks, and

- Antiquated technology and resulting in staff equipment requires tasks that could be easily automated or handled elsewhere in the County (primarily related to printing and mailing)

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Department is well organized, yet suffers from little administrative support
- Management is currently analyzing the costs of contracts vs inside labor

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Aging staff with institutional knowledge
- No succession program in place
- Little clerical support
- Antiquated technology and equipment
- Significant monthly mailings that require use of staff
- Work orders are incomplete
- Employees are not assigned efficiently
- Duplicative EMS academies

Capital Needs

During the in-person interviews, it was indicated that the replacement of safety equipment could be better handled. Such items are sometimes provided secondhand from other departments. In addition, technology within the department is antiquated. The department utilizes its workforce to conduct large monthly mailings. Such tasks could be automated or transferred elsewhere in the County. This would free up departmental staff to focus on other key areas of operation.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Department of Human Services are as follows:

Department Vision: The Nassau County Department of Human Services provides the residents of Nassau County with a constituent centered and holistic approach to the delivery of services and information. It coordinates the skills, abilities, and professionalism of the Office for the Aging, the Office for Youth Services, the Office for the Physically Challenged, and the Office of Mental Health, Chemical Dependency, and Developmental Disabilities Services in an integrated and seamless manner.

Department Mission: The Department of Human Services provides the residents of Nassau County with increased access to the wide array of services and information provided by the County through a collaborative and coordinated structure. Improved communication and accessibility are the hallmarks of the information, assistance, and services provided by the four Offices that comprise the Department.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 218)

Department Overview

The Department is comprised of five divisions, which are further detailed below.

- Office for the Aging
 - Plan and develop programs and policies to meet the needs of older citizens and provide unbiased information and assistance to individuals of all ages who require long-term care services. OFA is part of the New York Connects project that fulfills the Federal mandates for Aging and Disability Resource Centers.
- Office for Youth Services
 - Promote self-esteem, positive values, morals, citizenship and dignity, as well as physical, social, and mental well-being among the youth of Nassau County.
- Office for the Physically Challenged
 - Provide services with dignity and respect to persons with disabilities, serve as a disability rights advocacy agency, and provide comprehensive and cost-effective compliance with Federal, State, and local mandates. The OPC administers the NYS Handicapped Parking Permit Program and coordinates the Volunteer Enforcement Program with the Nassau County Police Department.
- Office of Mental Health, Chemical Dependency and Developmental Disabilities Services
 - Assure individuals of the availability of a full continuum of care and the delivery of best practices that enable them to achieve recovery. The Office also fosters the provision of services for the developmentally disabled that allows them to reach their potential for autonomous functioning and self-sufficiency. The Office is the “Local Governmental Unit” as defined in Section 41.13 of the New York State Mental Hygiene Statute.

Workforce

In-person interviews of key personnel of the Department have been conducted. During the interviews, several topics were discussed, including staffing. Together with data obtained from financial documents, below is a list of findings relative to the Department’s workforce.

- Approximately 90 budgeted employees
- Employees are cross-trained for emergency situations but not as an everyday event
- No succession plan to fill lost and retired positions
- Department expects significant retirement in next two years

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Much of Department’s budget is funded through grants and chargebacks

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Incredible amount of uncertainty going forward regarding healthcare
- Department estimates approximately 40% of employees are eligible for retirement

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**Mission and Vision**

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Department of Information Technology are as follows:

Departments' Vision: The Department of Information Technology strives to be a national leader in providing our constituents with the highest quality of technology services. Information Technology will implement and support technologies that increase and improve service to constituents while maximizing investments.

Department's Mission: The Department of Information Technology provides high quality, department-focused information technology services and business solutions to County departments in support of their missions.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 229)

Department Overview

- Provides customer service to its internal and external customers
- IT serves as the central point for planning, implementing, and supporting technology initiatives and infrastructure in the County
- Team establishes strategic directions for technology and telecommunications, encourages cross-agency collaborations that are mutually beneficial, and advocates best practices for operations and project management
- Department actively collaborates with other County departments and management to implement common technology solutions and services that enable efficient operations and delivery of County services, while maximizing the County's investment in technology

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Currently staff 88 employees
 - Department has implemented clearly defined promotional paths and title descriptions to accurately align workforce
- Utilize 36 outsourced contractors
- Department provides continuous training to workforce

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Increased collaboration with colleagues and clients by enabling real time data communication
- Increased case load management allowing users to do access State management systems on I-Pads
- Mobiles device acceptance has successes in Department of Social Services for case workers to complete forms in the field, yielding a 25% time savings from the ability to have primary case work application available
- Trends in the IT industry are exercised at County to position itself to take advantage of emerging technologies
 - Operational improvements by use of business intelligence tools that measure productivity
 - Enhancing constituent communication and increase outreach through modern electronic outlets
 - Offloading expensive datacenter costs by enabling cloud computing and pushing operational cost to offsite vendors
 - Improving workflow efficiencies by providing smart mobile devices to bring the work on the road
 - Enabling license-free municipal data sharing for government transparency enhancements
 - Protecting internal assets with advanced cyber threat protection security planning
 - Reducing operational costs by implementing technology for strategic operational improvements

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Need to hire additional staff made up of Oracle, Linux, and Microsoft programmers as well as IT technical Staff to execute on these projects
- Needs to be a countywide focus on technology and operational improvements thought enabling the IT department to force automation and operational improvements and removing any and all manual processes

Upcoming Information Technology Plans

- Roll out a PeopleSoft HCM System - Payroll, Benefits, Time and labor being released later this year
- Continue Roll Out of the VOIP Telephone system upgrade and remove the old system completely
- Advance network Security and add Advanced Network protection to scan internal traffic on the network
- Enable Amazon Cloud and Microsoft Azure to offload critical systems to the cloud at great cost savings
- Train existing staff and hire additional software developer titles and IT support staff and advance operational capabilities

DEPARTMENT OF PROBATION

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Department of Probation are as follows:

Department Vision: The Nassau County Probation Department will continue its collaborative relationship with state and local criminal justice stakeholders to facilitate better outcomes for offenders.

Department Mission: The Nassau County Probation Department strives to make our communities safer, reduce crime, and assist victims by holding offenders accountable and offering opportunities for rehabilitation to restore victims and maintain law-abiding behavior.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 253)

Department Overview

- Pre-Disposition Investigation
 - Probation prepares court-ordered pre-disposition reports for both the Criminal and the Family Courts. These are comprehensive offender evaluations that include actuarially-based risk assessments and identify viable dispositional alternatives. Correctional facilities and New York State Division of Parole rely on the reports as well.
- Probation Supervision
 - Probation Supervision is the most common Court-imposed sanction and the most cost-effective alternative to incarceration. Probation Officers enforce the conditions of probation established by the Court. These typically include restitution to victims, treatment for addiction or emotional problems, electronic surveillance, and community service. Probation believes it is essential to match system response to an offender's risk of recidivism and is fully committed to actuarial based risk assessment to determine offender risk, needs, and services. Probation also employs a range of technological aids including ignition interlock devices, remote alcohol monitoring, house arrest, and GPS monitoring. Field Operations are an essential part of Probation Supervision and include on and off hour visit. Special Operations are coordinated and supported with the assistance from the Police, DA, Traffic Safety Board, and State Grants. Nassau County offenders are given every reasonable opportunity to make community supervision work, and those who do not, are held strictly accountable.
- DWI Monitoring
 - Offenders sentenced under the Leandra's Law-statute are required to have an ignition interlock device installed in any vehicle owned or operated by the offender. Monitoring of offenders sentenced to a Conditional Discharge is conducted by Probation Officers in Probation's Alcohol Interlock Monitoring (AIM) Program. Probation Officers in the Criminal Division DWI Units conduct monitoring of offenders sentenced to Probation.

- Pre-Trial Services
 - New York State Division of Criminal Justice Service (DCJS) funding supports Probation's efforts to keep the percentage of pre-trial detainees as low as possible and allows the Nassau County Correctional Center to operate at a more cost-efficient classification level.
- Adolescent Diversion
 - Nassau County Adolescent Diversion Program (ADP), which is one of nine pilot sites statewide, has been operational since January 17, 2012. Probation risk-assesses non-violent 16 and 17 year-olds to help identify those adolescents appropriate for diversion and those requiring services to address specific needs, which left unaddressed, increase their potential for further antisocial behavior.
- Family Division Services
 - The Family Division consists of Intake, Investigations, and Community Supervision Services. Probation Intake is mandated to provide adjustment services to divert appropriate Juveniles from family Court. Each case is risk assessed and individuals are referred to services that match their needs. Cases unable to be adjusted are referred to Family Court for formal court intervention. Investigation and Supervision services are court ordered and consist of matters of Child Custody, Adoptions, Child Abuse and Neglect, Juvenile Delinquency, Persons in Need of Supervision (PINS), Family Offence, Guardianship, and Consent to marry for underage persons.
- Juvenile Detention Center
 - Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) provides secure detention or juvenile awaiting Family or Criminal Court appearances. We strive to provide a high level of care for out juveniles while controlling fiscal costs. State reimbursement offsets 49% of the local costs and we continue to rent unused beds to other counties on a per diem, 100% reimbursement basis.

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Approximately 190 employees
 - 10 under budgeted head count
- Department estimates 10-15% of staff are eligible for retirement

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Department is reimbursed 100% of costs for out-of-county youths
- Department is reimbursed 49% of costs for in-county youths

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Costs ~\$200k per year to incarcerate juvenile versus ~\$60k per for an adult
- Department has no collection staff
 - Approximately \$179 million outstanding in collections
 - Approximately 20,000 open obligations
- On October 1, 2018, maximum age for juveniles will increase, requiring more officers

POLICE DEPARTMENT**Mission and Vision**

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Police Department are as follows:

Department Vision: The Nassau County Police Department maintains and enhances the confidence and trust of the people served; strengthens and extends partnerships with communities served; maximizes community participation in identifying and resolving problems; and establishes relevant Department priorities and policies, while protecting life and property and maintaining and enhancing the Department's tradition of excellence in police service to the community.

Department Mission: The Nassau County Police Department serves and protects the people of the County and provides safety and improved quality of life in our communities through excellence in policing.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 258)

Department Overview

The Department provides uniformed patrol police services in six precincts, which cover approximately 85% of the geographical area of the County. Village and city police departments police the remaining areas of the County. In addition, the Department provides investigative services and certain specialized police services to all municipalities within the County in support of the local police departments. These special services include Detective Investigations, Emergency Ambulance, Highway Patrol, Special Operations, Crisis Negotiation, Police Training, Applicant Investigations, and other services.

Operationally, the Department consists of Support Services and two Divisions, each with specific functions and responsibilities.

- **Support Services**
 - Provide a wide range of services vital to the Department's infrastructure and functionality. These include Information Technology, Fleet Service Bureau, Communications Bureau, Arrest Processing, Records Management, and Training.
- **Detective Division**
 - Investigate reported crimes, arrests offenders, and participates in criminal prosecutions. In addition to the precinct detective squads, other squads include the

Arson/Bomb, Crimes Against Property, Electronics, Homicide, Robbery, Special Services, Central Detectives, Evidence Management, Narcotics/Vice, and Special Investigations.

- **Patrol Division**

- Provide uniformed police services through the six precincts, Highway Patrol, Marine/Aviation Bureau, Mounted Unit, Emergency Ambulance Bureau, and the Bureau of Special Operations.

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Department currently operates with about 2,400 officers
 - Approximately 60 Public Safety employees in the Department
 - Half of which is estimated to be retirement eligible
- Due to minimum staffing level requirements, a reduction in staff results in increased overtime expenses
- Department estimates more than half of personnel are eligible for retirement and expects to lose approximately 200 officers by year-end
 - Officers are only required to provide 15 days of notice prior to retiring

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Department has made progress to civilianize as many positions as possible
 - However, some administrative jobs still performed by officers
- Aviation Bureau is state-of-the-art and provides medical transportation
- Public Safety officers are much cheaper than Department personnel;
 - Valuable resource for County departments and buildings where police officers would be costly

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Overtime costs are excessive;
 - Department uses antiquated, hand-written system to track overtime
- Union grievances
 - Contractual minimum staffing levels
 - Only Police Department in country with requirement
- Department has staff which duplicate functions of other County departments
 - Fleet maintenance
 - IT staff
 - In-house attorneys
- Public Safety
 - Employees require two weeks' notice to change shifts, reducing flexibility for management

- Difficulty hiring seasonal employees due to extensive vetting process
- Auxiliary police have limited scope of functions
- Department continues to lose best employees to Police Department
- Overtime for non-park facilities has increased 43%

PARKS, RECREATION & MUSEUMS

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Parks, Recreation & Museums Department are as follows:

Department Vision: The Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums provides stewardship of parks and natural areas, promotes health, fitness, and well-being through superior recreational facilities and cultural programs, and provides fulfilling and memorable leisure experiences.

Department Mission: The Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums works with citizens, non-profit partners, and other government agencies to provide and maintain the highest-quality parks, programs, and recreational facilities. The Department seeks to enhance the physical state of the parks through prudent and targeted capital improvements.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 194)

Department Overview

The Parks Department is comprised of five divisions, which are further detailed below.

- Administration
 - Provides planning, policy-making, and administrative support. In addition to the Commissioner's Office, other functional units include Personnel, Payroll, Budget and Planning, Public Information, and Special Events. These units help procure goods and services, coordinate and promote department-sponsored events, handle constituent complaints and issues, develop partnerships with community-based non-profit organizations and private businesses, and sanction group-use of parks through the issuance of permits.
- Recreation Services Division
 - Responsible for all park recreational programming. Staff open and operate parks, ice rinks, athletic facilities, beaches and pools, and other park facilities; offer swimming, skating, hockey and tennis lessons; and help staff special events such as the Long Island Marathon and the Long Island Fair. The Division is also responsible for the Nassau County Rifle and Pistol Range, which is the only such facility open to the public in the County.
- Museums Division
 - Provides cultural and educational programming at the County's museums and historic properties with a diverse range of programming with concentrations on geology, the environment and wildlife, African-American and Native-American history, and 19th century Long Island history. The County has five affiliated museums: Nassau County Museum of Fine Arts, Children's Museum, Cradle of Aviation, Holocaust Museum, and Hewlett House.

- Golf Operations Division
 - Responsible for golf course maintenance, operations, and related programming. Staff manages and maintains seven golf courses (three 18-hole courses at Eisenhower Park and five nine-hole courses in four different parks), three driving ranges, and two mini-golf courses.
- Grounds and Maintenance Division
 - Responsible for maintaining all County parks, museums, and preserves. The Division provides basic technical support and repair services and works with Public Works staff on intensive technical support needs. Direct responsibilities include maintaining athletic fields, mowing, garbage removal, tree planting and pruning, and general outdoor maintenance of benches, marinas, mini-golf, sidewalks, bathrooms, etc.

Workforce

In-person interviews of key personnel of the Department have been conducted. During the interviews, several topics were discussed, including staffing. Together with data obtained from financial documents, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Approximately 145-150 budgeted full-time employees;
- Trend of full-time employees has been decreasing in recent years while seasonal employees have remained relatively stable;
- Lack of middle management has led to a misalignment of employees, requiring higher level employees to work outside of their job descriptions;
- No succession plan to fill lost and retired positions;

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Department generates revenue to cover expenses;
- Department is well organized, yet suffers from little administrative support

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- County charter requires a stand-alone Parks Department, however, none of the Department's services are mandated;
- Full-time golf employees are part of union and being paid during winter months;
- Aging staff with institutional knowledge;
- No succession program in place;
- Employees are not assigned efficiently

Capital Needs

- Trucks for department use;
- Improvements to Wantagh baseball fields
- Renovations to historic properties/museums

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Department of Public Works are as follows:

Department Vision: The Department of Public Works serves Nassau County residents and the business community by effectively and efficiently providing improvements to the County infrastructure, protecting the environment, and ensuring a community that is a safe and enjoyable place to live and work.

Department Mission: The Department of Public Works strives to achieve excellence in the delivery of essential services such as planning, designing, constructing, managing, operating, and preserving Nassau County's network of infrastructure, transportation, real estate, and environmental and natural resources.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 283)

Department Overview

The Department is comprised of five divisions, which are further detailed below.

- Administration
 - Provides overall leadership and direction of the Department. It also provides administrative support, fiscal management, staff development and management of human resources, information technology, and public information. Included in the Administration Division is the Capital Program Office, which develops and manages all County capital projects within the scope of the Multi-Year Capital Plan. The General and Capital Funds support Departmental operations.
- Engineering
 - *Water/Wastewater Engineering* handles all ground and surface water interactions and investigations. This includes well sampling, salt-water intrusion investigations, and ground water contamination issues, as well as all storm water management program components including drainage, design, and construction. The wastewater group handles all design and construction related to the wastewater treatment plants and the sewer system, including all pump stations and sanitary sewer infrastructure.
 - *Civil and Site Engineering* designs and constructs all buildings and structures under the control of the County.
 - *Traffic Engineering* performs traffic surveys on all County roadways. They guide decision-making for signs, signals, and other devices for direction and control of traffic and improvements in street and highway safety design for all users of Nassau County's roadways including motorists, motorcyclists, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
 - *Traffic Safety Division* manages the Nassau County Child Passenger Safety Program that trains parents how to restrain their children in an appropriate child safety seat. It also manages the County's STOP DWI Program that works to reduce the number of deaths or injuries in alcohol and drug-related crashes. The

STOP DWI Coordinator administers the program and coordinates the efforts of law enforcement, prosecution of offenders, probation, and public information and education. Traffic Safety, working with Traffic Engineering, assists in the site selection for the Red Light Camera Program using engineering data along with safety statistics.

- *Transit Division* oversees and manages the County's bus contract with TransDev Services, Inc. and ensures compliance with all Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) requirements.
- *Construction Management* manages and supervises the construction contracts for parks, buildings, roadways, and wastewater facilities.
- *Planning* reviews and analyzes subdivision applications, County map revisions, and open space acquisitions, and development applications that appear before the Planning Commission; processes and reviews zoning referrals received from Nassau County's 69 municipalities; and makes recommendations to the Planning Commission. The Division also manages and oversees FTA earmarks/grants.
- Operations
 - *Facilities Management* maintains all buildings and structures under County control.
 - *Road Maintenance* maintains all County-owned roads and medians.
 - *Bridge Maintenance* operates and maintains the two County drawbridges.
 - *Snow Operations* removes snow and ice on County roadways and bridges.
 - *Drainage Maintenance* manages drainage from the flow of storm water runoff at drainage channels, streams, storm water basins, and drainage culverts.
 - *Mosquito Control* protects public health through aerial and ground spraying.
 - *Signs & Pavement Markings* maintains County street signs and markings.
- Fleet Management
 - The Fleet Management Division administers and coordinates the County's fleet, vehicle-related equipment, machinery, and resources, e.g., fuel for all County departments except the Police.
- Real Estate
 - Administers and coordinates all real estate matters on behalf of the County. It manages the County's leased properties, 40 landmark units for the Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums, and 60 residential units in Mitchel Field. It assists with other special projects such as appraising and negotiating the purchase of "open space" and other properties necessary for County purposes. The Division also negotiates the sale of surplus County property.

Workforce

In-person interviews of key personnel of the Department have been conducted. During the interviews, several topics were discussed, including staffing. Together with data obtained from financial documents, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Approximately 430 budgeted employees;
- Employees are cross-trained for emergency situations but not as an everyday event due to union restrictions;
- No succession plan to fill lost and retired positions;
- Department expects significant retirement in next two years

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Department is well organized, yet suffers from little administrative support
- Management is currently analyzing the costs of contracts vs inside labor

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Restricted with ability to hire consultants to perform certain functions due to union grievances. Could push functions with liabilities to contractor/consultant. Could also be used as a cost-saving measure.
- Aging staff with institutional knowledge;
- No succession program in place
- Procurement process is lengthy and not centralized
- RFP process is slow
- Fleet maintenance duties duplicated with Police Department

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES**Mission and Vision**

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Department of Social Services are as follows:

Department Vision: Positively affect the health, safety, and well-being of individuals and families by offering comprehensive support services through effective, efficient, and respectful service delivery, as well as enhanced communication and collaboration with other government agencies, schools, hospitals, and community-based organizations

Department Mission: Provide financial assistance and support services to residents of Nassau County in accordance with Federal, State, and local regulations and laws as well as protect children, adults, and families by enforcing all State mandates by establishing, maintaining, and enforcing child support orders

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 298)

Department Overview

- Provide temporary financial aid to eligible recipients through programs such as the Family Assistance, Safety Net Assistance, Food Stamp, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (formerly Food Stamps), Emergency Assistance to Families, Emergency Assistance to Adults, Employment, Medicaid, and Home Energy Assistance Programs
- Establishing, through its Child Support Enforcement program, an initial child support obligation of a legally responsible individual as designated by Family Court, collecting support payments, and enforcing and modifying existing support orders

- Providing employment and placement services to prepare public assistance recipients for long-term employment
- Protecting individuals, such as children through Children Services (foster care), Preventive and Child Protective Services, and adults and families through Adult Protective Services, by enforcing the child and adult abuse mandates of New York State Social Services Law

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- 2 IT employees on staff for building
- Federal/State/County oversight agencies
- Bifurcated between state and county
- Aging contracts

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Overhaul of department took place in 2013-2014
- Technology upgrade saves time and increases efficiency

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- 2008 lawsuit alleged Department wasn't processing in timely manner, need minimum 92-94%
- 35% of operations not reimbursed
- Initial reimbursement helps but long term is weak

COUNTY TREASURER

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the County Treasurer are as follows:

Department Vision: The Office of the Treasurer strives to improve its services and processes while balancing the need for efficiency and cost-effectiveness with required strong controls necessary to mitigate risk.

Department Mission: The Office of the Treasurer efficiently manages County funds and provides excellent customer and public information services, while actively safeguarding County funds.

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 311)

Department Overview

The Department is organized into four divisions, which are further detailed below.

- Debt and Investment Division
 - The Debt and Investment Division issues all County debt, invests County funds on a daily basis, tracks the use of bond and note proceeds, invest unexpended proceeds and maintains banking relationships.
- Tax Division
 - The Division maintains tax records, collects delinquent property taxes and processes property tax refunds. The Division also conducts an annual tax lien sale and responds to (FOIL) requests from the public and public tax information requests.
- Accounting Division
 - The Division processes the County payroll and vendor payments. It also receives Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) payments, verifies and approves all cash receipts, balances the County's bank accounts on a monthly basis. The Division maintains records of all County debt; including Nassau County Interim Finance Authority (NIFA) issued debt, processes debt service payments, acts as custodian for court and trust funds and issues all County checks.
 - The Accounting Division also issues certificates of residency and collects special taxes, including the County's share of Belmont Park Admission fees, Entertainment Ticket surcharge and Hotel/Motel taxes.
- Tax Certiorari Division
 - This unit processes all Petitions, Judgements and Small Claims refunds and ensures payments are processed correctly.

Workforce

In-person interviews of key personnel of the Department have been conducted. During the interviews, several topics were discussed, including staffing. Together with data obtained from financial documents, below is a list of findings relative to the Department's workforce.

- Approximately 27 budgeted employees

TRAFFIC AND PARKING VIOLATIONS AGENCY

Mission and Vision

As noted in the 2017 Adopted Budget, the vision and mission of the Department of Traffic and Parking Violations are as follows:

Department Vision: To provide optimum customer service in a prompt and courteous manner and enhance public safety through education and enforcement

Department Mission: To enhance pedestrian and vehicular safety through education and timely adjudication of all traffic, parking, and photo enforcement related offenses

Source: The 2017 Adopted Budget of the County (page 314)

Department Overview

- Administers and adjudicates traffic and parking tickets for Nassau County and other municipalities as well as Photo Enforcement Notices of Liability (“NOL”)
- Department utilizes both in-house resources and outside collection vendors, including default judgments and “boot and tow”, to recoup outstanding revenue owed
- Works in conjunction with the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles to suspend the license and/or driving privilege of motorists who fail to respond to violations or pay post disposition fines and fees

Workforce

Based on the 2017 Adopted Budget and departmental interviews, below is a list of findings relative to the Department’s workforce.

- Approximately 45 employees in Department
 - Department contracts with 15-16 part-time judges
 - Prosecutors are part-time employees

Strengths

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key strengths noted within the Department.

- Department utilizes contracts with outside entities to perform services
 - Red light camera contract costs \$10 million per year but generates revenue of over \$20 million
- Red light cameras have reduction County accidents by 35% since 2009

Weaknesses/Threats

Based on departmental interviews and financial documents, below is a summary of key weaknesses and threats noted within the Department.

- Need to Implement default convictions for failure-to-appear at traffic, parking and NOL trials and hearings
- Court process is antiquated and timely
 - Upgraded computer systems and more efficient software and interface would improve Department’s efficiency and decrease time at court for constituents
- Should implement a Distracted Driver Safety Program in an effort to reduce crashes caused by drivers using mobile devices while vehicle is in motion

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

SECTION V – CONCLUSION

The information provided throughout the Report is based on a detailed analysis of the County’s operational budget and multi-year financial plan. Although the budget provides useful budgetary and operational information for public understanding, it does not include sufficient budget detail or data for an in-depth technical review and analysis. As such, additional information was requested and promptly provided by County Officials. We appreciate and commend the cooperation of the County Executive’s Staff and the Office of Management and Budget in providing both detailed budget data as well as assistance to understand the construction of the budget documents.

The cost reduction initiatives identified in the Report will assist the County to close the forecasted budget deficit and to develop sustainable financial operations. In addition, the shared services and technology strategies discussed throughout the Report will mitigate the effect of such reductions.

Despite the challenges that may be ahead, the development of the Report alone denotes that steps are being taken toward corrective measures. Success will be largely contingent upon a coordinated effort and collaboration between various interested parties. Nevertheless, a sustainable budget in the near-term can be an achievable goal.

END OF REPORT

APPENDIX A

BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS

CONSISTING OF:

BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY
EXPENDITURE TREND ANALYSIS
BUDGETARY VARIANCE TREND ANALYSIS
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS – EXPENDITURES
DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ANALYSIS

APPENDIX A – BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

Background

The primary objective of this analysis is to identify operational, structural and fiscal items that will yield immediate financial and budgetary savings to the County, thereby reducing budget risks which could endanger the County's statutory requirement to achieve structural balance on a GAAP basis. CMA conducted a comprehensive review of the County's 2017 operational budget and 2017-2020 multi-year financial plan, which serves as the primary focus of this section. In addition, since the growth rate of expenditures is projected to exceed that of revenues over the measured period (fiscal 2017 through 2020), the following analysis will focus exclusively on expenditures.

Methodology

Appendix A incorporates a detailed assessment of the County's operating budget and multi-year plan. While there is no singular method to evaluate such plans, a comprehensive approach focusing on both external and internal fiscal indicators was implemented to identify structural weaknesses and potential risks. Although comprehensive, the scope of the analysis was intentionally limited to certain key factors. As such, the budgetary assessment serves as a reliable foundation for our decision making, which will be referenced throughout the Report.

Although an emphasis was placed on the 2017 operational budget and 2017-2020 multi-year financial plan, prior years were also examined. The methodology included the following elements:

- *Trend Analysis* – Evaluating historical fiscal data provides constructive information that can be used to both identify structural imbalances and predict future risks. Data covering a five-year period was analyzed in connection with the County.
- *Expenditure Variance Analysis* – Operating budgets were compared against the audited financial statements for each of the fiscal years 2011 through 2015. The results were utilized to evaluate accuracy.
- *Financial Ratios* – Utilizing data from the trend analysis, the financial ratios were used to quantify areas of strength and weakness.
- *Benchmark Analysis* – Similar to the trend analysis, the benchmarks were used to compare the County to its peers (downstate counties). Financial data for several counties was obtained from New York State and then converted to a per-capita basis.

As noted, Appendix A is intended to provide a baseline which will be referenced throughout the Report.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

EXPENDITURE TREND ANALYSIS

A trend analysis can identify underlying causes of fiscal stress and be used to forecast future financial outcomes. When connected with a multi-year plan and summarized through tables and charts, atypical assumptions or abnormal financial patterns become visually recognizable. Thus, as a baseline, the trend analysis is an important aspect of the Report and will be referenced throughout. For the purposes of the Report, the analysis was limited to County expenditures.

As is common with many municipal jurisdictions, the services provided by the County are extremely labor-intensive, and, as a result, employee wages and benefits account for the majority of the County's annual expenditures. In the Major Operating Funds, salaries and wages constitute approximately 30% of total expenditures, while fringe benefits account for an additional 20% of such expenditures. Exhibit I provides a summary of the actual expenditures for the 2013-2016 fiscal years and the projected amount for 2017.

Exhibit I Major Operating Funds Expenditure Summary

EXPENDITURE CATEGORY:	2013	2014	2015	2016	(Projected) 2017 ⁽¹⁾
Salaries & Wages	\$ 794,722,116	\$ 824,929,678	\$ 818,306,227	\$ 839,658,747	\$ 882,649,196
Fringe Benefits	456,403,398	464,006,054	475,096,830	501,979,811	544,712,591
Medicaid	254,850,679	248,230,297	235,725,135	237,423,889	234,975,565
DSS Entitlement Programs	182,181,274	175,533,094	175,774,422	166,064,979	171,558,171
Contractual Services	222,833,005	236,711,356	242,172,528	246,131,311	247,621,855
Administrative Expenses	69,309,123	72,878,504	71,167,204	62,813,205	73,973,560
Debt Service (Interest & Principal) ⁽²⁾	134,026,813	151,335,384	164,158,118	183,450,296	209,915,920
Local Government Assistance	68,316,548	65,321,196	66,494,098	67,746,680	67,149,582
Mass Transportation	42,517,105	42,785,669	42,697,935	42,884,542	43,699,392
Other Expenditures	455,282,077	428,407,673	426,289,281	438,949,703	421,954,615
Total Operating Expenditures	\$2,680,442,138	\$2,710,138,905	\$2,717,881,778	\$2,787,103,163	\$2,898,210,447
OTHER FINANCING USES:					
Other	\$ 408,230,041	\$ 401,091,978	\$ 411,256,724	\$ 433,482,490	\$ 426,637,246
TOTAL EXPENDITURES & OTHER FINANCING USES	\$3,088,672,179	\$3,111,230,883	\$3,129,138,502	\$3,220,585,653	\$3,324,847,693

(1) As of March 31, 2017.

(2) Excludes NIFA set-asides which are included in other expenses.

Source: Preliminary Official Statement of the County, dated May 23, 2017.

Despite recent declines in staffing, expenditures relating to employee compensation (salaries and other fringe benefits) continue to be a major concern for the County's finances. To properly address the structural deficit in the County's budget, union contracts, wages and benefits would require a more comprehensive analysis. Nevertheless, such an analysis would be time consuming, require legal consultation and likely the results would not yield immediate relief. As

such, although personnel matters were reviewed in connection with the Report, it was done so with the intention of identifying only immediate cost savings opportunities and not to address any underlying (legal) limitations of union contracts.

Each of the six collective bargaining organizations representing County employees and non-represented fulltime employees are highlighted in Exhibit II:

Exhibit II
Fulltime County Employees and Collective Bargaining Organizations

Organization:	Membership:	Contract Expiration Date:
Civil Service Employees Association	3,472	12-31-17
Police Benevolent Association	1,713	12-31-17
Detectives Association, Inc.	321	12-31-17
Correction Officers Benevolent Association	807	12-31-17
Investigators Police Benevolent Association	35	12-31-12 ⁽¹⁾
Superior Officers Association	<u>354</u>	12-31-17
Total Represented Fulltime Employees	6,702	N/A
Non-Represented Fulltime Employees	<u>590</u>	N/A
Total Fulltime Employees	7,292	N/A

- (1) The Investigators Police Benevolent Association represents investigators employed by the District Attorney. On September 13, 2012, an arbitration panel issued an award covering an eight-year period (December 1, 2004 through December 31, 2012). In the absence of a new agreement, all the terms of such an expired agreement continue until a new agreement is negotiated.

Source: Nassau County Preliminary Official Statement, dated May 23, 2017.

Comparative Employee Analysis (Downstate Region Counties). Exhibit III on the following page provides a comparative analysis of the County's full-time employees represented by a collective bargaining unit against those of other New York Downstate Region counties. The Downstate Region includes the following counties: Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, Rockland, Putnam, Dutchess and Orange.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

Exhibit III
Per Capita Comparative Employee Analysis
Fulltime Represented Employees ⁽¹⁾
Downstate Region

Rank	County:	Estimated Population	Estimated Represented Employees	Represented Employees To Population	Estimate As Of
1.	Westchester	949,113	4,240	223.8	January 2017
2.	Putnam	99,710	478	208.6	June 2016
3.	Nassau	1,339,532	6,702	199.9	May 2017
4.	Dutchess	297,488	1,527	194.8	March 2017
5.	Rockland	311,687	1,765	176.6	March 2017
6.	Suffolk ⁽²⁾	1,493,350	8,749	170.7	April 2017
7.	Orange	372,813	2,425	153.7	September 2016

(1) The representation does not account for variations in services provided by each jurisdiction.

(2) Represented employees are estimated at 95% of all fulltime equivalent employees.

Source: Information obtained from the MSRB (Official Statements and Annual Continuing Disclosure Filing Statements).

Employees – Conclusion

Despite recent efforts to reduce the size of its workforce, the County continues to display moderate to high level of staff when compared to its peers. As noted in Exhibit III, the County retains 1 employee per 199.9 residents, which ranks 3rd of the counties measured. Based on the above assessment, at a gross level, it appears as though the County’s workforce could sustain further reductions. Further details and recommendations can be found in Section III of the Report. Nevertheless, staff reductions should be carefully considered on a targeted basis to mitigate complex and costly contractual matters. Given the overall age of the County workforce, staffing levels can likely be reduced to a degree through attrition. An aggressively promoted retirement program could be motivating, particularly as most labor contracts are approaching expiration.

BUDGETARY VARIANCE TREND ANALYSIS

The Government Finance Officers Association (“GFOA”) recommends the evaluation of fiscal performance relative to a jurisdiction’s adopted budget. By monitoring results, structural problems can be identified and the padding of expenditures can be detected. Findings of consistent, positive variances in expenditure categories can support budgetary reductions in those areas. For the purpose of the Report, a three-year analysis was conducted on the County’s Major Operating Funds. The findings of the trend analysis are provided in Exhibit IV and Exhibit V and are further discussed after Exhibit V.

Exhibit IV
County of Nassau
Major Operating Funds ⁽¹⁾
Budget to Actual Performance – Revenue Variance Analysis
Fiscal Years Ended December 31, 2013 – 2015

REVENUE:	2013 Variance	2014 Variance	2015 Variance
BA - INT PENALTY ON TAX	\$ 4,009,567	\$ 1,877,920	\$ 3,560,615
BC - PERMITS & LICENSES	3,510,108	1,632,830	1,289,400
BD - FINES & FORFEITS	(1,102,148)	17,920,312	(41,109,955)
BE - INVEST INCOME	(1,117,394)	(545,929)	(115,587)
BF - RENTS & RECOVERIES	10,771,366	25,737,931	15,981,054
BG - REVENUE OFFSET TO EXPENSE	8,471,725	1,706,542	2,482,059
BH - DEPT REVENUES	(8,173,212)	(7,968,294)	(800,275)
BI - CAPITAL BACKCHARGES	(2,791,501)	(100,000)	196,135
BO - PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES	1,144,359	582,067	641,815
BQ - CAPITAL RESOURCES FOR DEBT	(15,717,326)	8,372,362	(85,777,425)
BR - DUE FROM OTHER GOVTS	195,987	0	0
BS - OTB PROFITS	0	0	(9,000,000)
BW - INTERFUND CHARGES REVENUE	(11,339,010)	(12,621,161)	(29,846,873)
FA - FEDERAL AID - REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES	(31,303,379)	(15,184,968)	4,214,642
IF - INTERFUND TRANSFERS	19,679,336	0	1,726,189
SA - STATE AID - REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES	(29,949,695)	(21,776,506)	1,113,830
TA - SALES TAX COUNTYWIDE	22,431,870	(66,556,768)	(40,395,478)
TB - SALES TAX PART COUNTY	(4,000,000)	(4,113,666)	0
TL - PROPERTY TAX	(1,677,894)	(3,692,461)	(155,312)
TO - OTB 5% TAX	106,744	(76,368)	213,075
TX - SPECIAL TAXES	176,023	(409,661)	297,822
SUM OF REVENUE VARIANCE (EXCLUDING FUND BALANCE & TRANSFERS)	\$ (36,674,474)	\$ (75,215,818)	\$(175,484,269)
INTERFUND TRANSFERS VARIANCE	(33,264,403)	(16,383,507)	(40,904,714)
AA - FUND BALANCE VARIANCE	71,990,537	116,545,435	106,002,650
SUM OF REVENUE VARIANCE (INCLUDING FUND BALANCE & TRANSFERS)	\$ 2,051,660	\$ 24,946,110	\$(110,386,333)

(1) Includes the General Fund, Debt Service Fund, Police District Fund, Police Headquarter Fund and the Fire Prevention Fund.

Source: The Adopted Budgets of the County (2015 through 2017).

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

Exhibit V
County of Nassau
Major Operating Funds ⁽¹⁾
Budget to Actual Performance – Expenditure Variance Analysis
Fiscal Years Ended December 31, 2013 – 2015

EXPENDITURES:	2013 Variance	2014 Variance	2015 Variance
AA - SALARIES, WAGES & FEES	\$ (10,077,173)	\$ (15,398,345)	\$ 32,838,682
AB - FRINGE BENEFITS	13,681,150	16,412,418	20,968,613
AC - WORKERS COMPENSATION	937,809	2,837,376	(1,186,593)
BB - EQUIPMENT	109,156	193,922	818,153
DD - GENERAL EXPENSES	(165,680)	971,609	1,093,432
DE - CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	(1,651,305)	536,180	11,757,547
DF - UTILITY COSTS	1,388,298	607,296	6,230,406
DG - VAR DIRECT EXPENSES	0	0	0
FF - INTEREST	10,221,667	9,806,285	4,416,727
GA - LOCAL GOVT ASST PROGRAM	(1,371,654)	4,251,493	2,007,755
GG - PRINCIPAL	3,729,999	6,544,999	5,895,000
HC - NHC ASSN EXP	0	0	13,000,000
HH - INTERFUND CHARGES	1,905,200	4,619,954	6,348,640
JA - CONTINGENCIES RESERVE	39,172	(160,769)	179,153
L3 - TRANS TO LITIGATION FUND	0	0	(20,200,000)
LB - TRANS TO GEN FUND	(1,252,082)	(11,048,242)	(1,604,822)
LF - TRANSFER FROM FCF FUND	0	0	(8,000,000)
LH - TRANS TO PDH SUITS & DAMAGES	(18,415,815)	0	0
MM - MASS TRANSPORTATION	747,471	790,077	673,328
NA - NCIFA EXPENDITURES	526,000	410,000	350,000
OO - OTHER EXPENSES	53,056,594	26,645,421	132,279,994
PP - EARLY INTERVENTION/SPECIAL EDUCATION	32,889,565	9,168,986	2,233,942
SS - RECIPIENT GRANTS	6,506,617	4,624,924	453,555
TT - PURCHASED SERVICES	(5,195,541)	(4,499,383)	51,307
WW - EMERGENCY VENDOR PAYMENTS	5,419,055	6,283,386	5,428,292
XX - MEDICAID	(1,761,314)	5,027,203	16,530,596
SUM OF EXPENDITURE VARIANCE (EXCLUDING TRANSFERS)	\$ 91,267,189	\$ 68,624,790	\$232,563,707
INTERFUND TRANSFERS VARIANCE	33,300,403	27,431,749	40,915,337
SUM OF EXPENDITURE VARIANCE (INCLUDING TRANSFERS)	\$124,567,592	\$ 96,056,539	\$273,479,044

(1) Includes the General Fund, Debt Service Fund, Police District Fund, Police Headquarter Fund and the Fire Prevention Fund.

Source: The Adopted Budgets of the County (2015 through 2017).

Major Operating Funds – Revenue Variance Findings

For the fiscal years ended December 31, 2013 through 2015, excluding transfers and the use of fund balance, the sum of variances for each year were negative in the amounts of \$36.7 million, \$75.2 million and \$175.5 million, respectively. For each year, the actual use of fund balance was significantly greater than the amounts included in the adopted budgets. In fact, for 2013 to 2015, the use of fund balance exceeded the budgeted amounts by \$72.0 million, \$116.5 million and \$106.0 million, respectively. Based on the trend analysis, it is clear that a recurring structural imbalance is present with respect to several key revenue sources.

Major Operating Funds – Expenditure Variance Findings

The findings for expenditures sharply contrasted that of revenues. For each of the fiscal years ended December 31, 2013 through 2015, the sum of variances reported for expenditures, excluding transfers, were positive by \$91.3 million, \$68.6 million and \$232.8 million, respectively. Although a small annual variance would be appropriate, the disproportionate positive expenditure variances are suggestive of excessive slack in the budget.

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS - EXPENDITURES

The benchmark analysis evaluates various categories of County expenditures against those of other counties in the State. Such statistics will provide a baseline for measuring County operations and will be further discussed throughout the Report. To align costs across each of the measured counties, each component was converted to a per capita cost. Data for this section was obtained from New York State compiled data and is portrayed directly as it was reported

Exhibit VIII through Exhibit XII provide an illustration of how the County compares in certain expenditure categories to other downstate counties. For the purpose of the benchmark analysis, the Downstate Region includes the following counties: Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, Rockland, Putnam, Dutchess and Orange.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

Baseline Assumptions

Exhibit VIII provides a series of baseline assumptions relative to the County's size, population and landmass.

Exhibit VIII Benchmark Analysis - Expenditures Baseline Assumptions

Rank	County:	Estimated Population	Relative Size	Landmass (Sq. Miles)	Residents Per Sq. Mile
1.	Dutchess	297,488	Medium	795.6	374
2.	Nassau	1,339,532	Large	284.7	4,705
3.	Orange	372,813	Medium	811.7	459
4.	Putnam	99,710	Small	230.3	433
5.	Rockland	311,687	Medium	173.6	1,795
6.	Suffolk	1,493,350	Large	912.1	1,637
7.	Westchester	949,113	Large	430.5	2,205
County Rank ⁽¹⁾		2	N/A	5	1

(1) Rank is highest to lowest (1 being the highest, 7 the lowest).

Source: The Empire Center and New York State. Although the information was derived from official government sources, CMA cannot guarantee data accuracy or completeness.

Despite the small landmass of the County, ranked at 5 of 7, it is densely populated. The number of residents per square mile in the County is estimated to be more than double that of the next peer county (Westchester).

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

General Government Support

According to the New York Office of the State Comptroller, general government supports are those services provided by the jurisdiction for the benefit of the public or governmental body as a whole. Exhibit IX provides a per capita classification of general government support expenditures for each of the downstate counties.

Exhibit IX Per Capita Benchmark Analysis - Expenditures General Government Support – 2015 ^{(1) (2)}

Rank	County	SUBCATEGORIES						TOTAL GENERAL GOVT. SUPPORT
		Operations	Admin.	Distribution of Sales Tax	Misc. General Government	Zoning and Planning	Judgments	
1.	Dutchess	\$ 89.45	\$79.48	\$ 90.61	\$10.99	\$19.61	\$ 0.00	\$290.14
2.	Nassau	126.55	105.31	49.51	0.00	0.00	81.01	362.37
3.	Orange	370.85	86.69	186.52	3.56	37.83	16.39	701.84
4.	Putnam	69.78	124.99	0.00	0.00	7.43	3.27	205.47
5.	Rockland	62.26	152.33	39.87	12.37	8.49	11.05	286.37
6.	Suffolk	97.02	96.19	0.00	0.87	2.37	0.25	196.70
7.	Westchester	224.81	128.30	114.45	0.00	4.44	21.95	493.94
	County Rank ⁽¹⁾	3	4	4	N/A	N/A	1	3

(1) The categorization of expenditures was determined by the Office of State Comptroller and the numbers represented are those reported by the State. The State was unable to provide additional details relating to the composition of each sub-category. As such, a variation in the reporting of the sub-categories amongst the jurisdictions is possible. The presentation is for discussion purposes. CMA cannot guarantee data accuracy or completeness.

(2) Rank is highest to lowest (1 being the highest, 7 the lowest).

Source: The Empire Center, New York State and other official government sources.

Relative to general government support, the County posted the third highest expenditures of the downstate counties for 2015, the most recent year for which such information is available. For the judgments subcategory, the County posted the highest per capita costs by a substantial margin.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

Public Safety

According to the New York Office of the State Comptroller, public safety expenditures relate to costs for the protection of persons and property. Exhibit X provides a per capita classification of public safety expenditures for each of the downstate counties.

Exhibit X
Per Capita Benchmark Analysis - Expenditures
Public Safety – 2015 ^{(1) (2)}

Rank	SUBCATEGORIES								TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY
	County	Public Safety Admin.	Police	Fire	Emerg. Response	Correction Services	Homeland Security & Civil Defense	Misc. Public Safety	
1.	Dutchess	\$11.98	\$49.48	\$3.18	\$0.00	\$135.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$199.81
2.	Nassau	0.00	436.92	13.24	0.00	105.25	0.82	6.96	563.19
3.	Orange	17.51	32.13	1.99	0.00	103.20	4.37	5.04	164.24
4.	Putnam	35.66	124.29	0.00	1.57	89.86	1.11	0.00	252.48
5.	Rockland	2.26	69.04	11.61	0.00	83.35	1.91	10.66	179.67
6.	Suffolk	7.49	344.05	9.52	0.00	100.41	0.00	22.48	483.95
7.	Westchester	11.88	34.04	0.00	0.00	158.81	5.63	1.30	211.65
	County Rank ⁽¹⁾	N/A	1	1	N/A	3	5	3	1

(1) The categorization of expenditures was determined by the Office of State Comptroller and the numbers represented are those reported by the State. The State was unable to provide additional details relating to the composition of each sub-category. As such, a variation in the reporting of the sub-categories amongst the jurisdictions is possible. The presentation is for discussion purposes. CMA cannot guarantee data accuracy or completeness.

(2) Rank is highest to lowest (1 being the highest, 7 the lowest).

Source: The Empire Center, New York State and other official government sources.

As detailed above, public safety expenditures at the County far exceed those of the other downstate counties. The primary driver for this cost was the police, which accounted 77.6% of the County's total per capita cost estimate. The subcategory Fire Protection also had the highest per capita ranking relative to the other counties.

Therefore, if Nassau's per capita costs were the same as Suffolk's, Nassau's budgeted expenditures for public safety would be more than \$105 million lower than currently budgeted.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

Health

According to the New York Office of the State Comptroller, health expenditures relate to costs for the conservation and improvement of health. Exhibit XI provides a per capita classification of health expenditures for each of the downstate counties.

Exhibit XI Benchmark Analysis - Expenditures Health – 2015 ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾

Rank	County	SUBCATEGORIES						TOTAL HEALTH
		Public Health Admin.	Public Health Services	Mental Health Services	Environmental Services	Public Health Facilities	Misc. Public Health	
1.	Dutchess	\$23.99	\$ 77.95	\$72.97	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$174.90
2.	Nassau	27.25	105.67	7.47	5.54	0.00	35.40	181.33
3.	Orange	28.19	19.46	59.91	0.08	80.89	0.00	188.53
4.	Putnam	37.90	23.44	37.70	0.00	0.00	0.21	99.25
5.	Rockland	43.86	30.68	34.84	11.10	146.36	1.45	268.29
6.	Suffolk	14.23	11.58	24.20	9.20	0.00	31.40	90.62
7.	Westchester	18.94	14.43	14.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	48.25
	County Rank⁽¹⁾	4	1	7	3	3	1	3

(1) The categorization of expenditures was determined by the Office of State Comptroller and the numbers represented are those reported by the State. The State was unable to provide additional details relating to the composition of each sub-category. As such, a variation in the reporting of the sub-categories amongst the jurisdictions is possible. The presentation is for discussion purposes. CMA cannot guarantee data accuracy or completeness.

(2) Rank is highest to lowest (1 being the highest, 7 the lowest).

Source: The Empire Center, New York State and other official government sources.

Per capita health related costs were moderate for the County as compared to its peers. Overall the County's health expenditures ranked 3rd out of 7. However, the subcategory for public health services ranked substantially higher than the other counties.

If Nassau's Health per capita expenditures were comparable to Suffolk's, Nassau's expenditures for Health would be more than \$121 million lower.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

Transportation

According to the New York Office of the State Comptroller, transportation expenditures relate to costs for services to ensure the safe and adequate flow of vehicles and pedestrians. Exhibit XII provides a per capita classification of transportation expenditures for each of the downstate counties.

Exhibit XII Benchmark Analysis - Expenditures Transportation - 2015 ^{(1) (2)}

Rank	County	SUBCATEGORIES						TOTAL TRANS.
		Highways	Bus Service	Airports	Rail Service	Trans. Facilities	Miscellaneous Trans.	
1.	Dutchess	\$60.44	\$22.44	\$ 4.85	\$ 9.19	\$ 6.07	\$ 0.00	\$103.13
2.	Nassau	33.98	1.62	0.00	29.98	0.00	126.34	191.92
3.	Orange	64.16	0.00	2.20	1.70	5.32	9.19	82.56
4.	Putnam	75.45	21.44	0.00	13.00	14.90	22.27	147.07
5.	Rockland	56.36	83.31	0.00	0.00	13.61	12.16	165.45
6.	Suffolk	19.70	54.00	0.30	16.83	0.00	23.67	114.50
7.	Westchester	19.67	17.46	57.57	146.11	0.00	4.28	245.09
	County Rank ⁽¹⁾	5	6	5	2	5	1	2

(1) The categorization of expenditures was determined by the Office of State Comptroller and the numbers represented are those reported by the State. The State was unable to provide additional details relating to the composition of each sub-category. As such, a variation in the reporting of the sub-categories amongst the jurisdictions is possible. The presentation is for discussion purposes. CMA cannot guarantee data accuracy or completeness.

(2) Rank is highest to lowest (1 being the highest, 7 the lowest).

Source: The Empire Center, New York State and other official government sources.

Per capita transportation costs are high for the County, which ranked 2nd highest among downstate counties. Of the subcategories, the County ranked well for expenditures related to bus services. However, miscellaneous transportation costs were much higher than the other counties. As such, there are likely costs being classified as miscellaneous.

Of note is that Nassau and Suffolk have a comparable number of lane miles of roads (2,000 vs. 2,041), bridges (52 vs. 110) and bascules (2 vs. 4) yet Nassau per capita costs are 72% higher than Suffolk. This translates to \$19 million higher costs in Nassau.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ANALYSIS

County finances in New York vary significantly from other jurisdictions as result of State requirements to furnish residents with a magnitude of services and programs. In fact, according to the New York State Association of Counties, there are over 40 mandated State programs which must be financed, at least in part, by county governments. Defining these programs can be relatively straightforward. Some of the larger programs include Medicaid, child welfare, indigent criminal defense legal services and public assistance. Nevertheless, once indirect costs are factored in, the methodology to split discretionary and mandated costs can become somewhat complex and blurred. Sometimes, costs that may actually be discretionary in nature can easily be assumed as required.

Analysis at the County level shows that there is no clear delineation between mandated and discretionary expenditures. An itemization of services provided to CMA by the County reflect a methodology that assumed 95% of County expenditures are mandated. The primary contributing factor for such a large percentage was that salaries were included as a mandated cost. Although protected through collective bargaining agreements, including such costs as mandated distorts the actual ratio. Although the County has many unique attributes affecting its economic structure, it would be reasonable to assume that mandated versus discretionary functions would be somewhat similar across New York counties. As such, the following section provides a benchmark investigation into mandated and discretionary expenditures for other comparable counties. Information was readily available for the counties examined and provides a basis for the prospective, discretionary functions of the County. For comparative purposes, a mandated expenditure analysis of Nassau County's General Fund, which has been based on the Suffolk County methodology, has been included. The analysis is for estimation purposes only.

Nassau County

Following is a high level schedule of the County's major General Fund costs, which have been based on the restrictive methodology utilized by Suffolk County. Please note, certain costs were not easily obtainable from the County's budget documents. In such instances, the mandated cost was listed as unclear.

Special Note on Suffolk County Methodology: The Suffolk stature is very restrictive in defining mandated costs. If staffing levels to operate a mandated program are not specifically required by Court Order or by the State or Federal government, those personnel related costs are not considered to be mandated by Suffolk. This methodology provides complete latitude in determining the appropriate level of staff necessary to provide a service. For instance, the functions of the County Clerk are mandated by NYS statute however the staffing level required to record court and other documents are not specified in the authorizing statute. In theory, under this methodology, the department could be staffed with one person.

Below is an estimated breakdown of the County’s mandated General Fund expenditures based on the restrictive methodology utilized by Suffolk County.

NASSAU COUNTY - 2017 MANDATED EXPENSES (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)	
Court Facilities	<i>Unclear</i>
MCTA Aid - LIRR	29.5
Debt (1)	313.5
Social Services (2)	131.8
Safety Net	40.8
Medicaid Cap Payment	236.6
Employee Benefits - Retirement	60.3
Health Services	134.5
Probation	3.8
Sherriff (3)	150.4
TOTAL MANDATED COSTS	\$1,101.2

- (1) The County’s General Fund debt service is comparatively much higher than Suffolk County’s.
- (2) There was unclear data. The actual amount should be close to the \$156.7 million reported for Suffolk County.
- (3) Excludes the SLAP program and landlord tenant unit since the costs are not directly related to the operation of the jail. Nevertheless, comparative jail costs are estimated \$24 million greater than the mandated costs for Suffolk County.

Suffolk County

Following is a high level schedule of the major General Fund costs that Suffolk considers to be mandated. Unlike the County, Suffolk is very restrictive in defining mandated costs. If staffing levels to operate a mandated program are not specifically required by Court Order, the State or Federal government, personnel costs for a mandated program are considered discretionary. In fact, of Suffolk’s scheduled mandated costs, only 17% are for salaries and fringe benefits. The restrictive interpretation gives Suffolk latitude to decide on the level of staffing necessary to provide a service. For instance, the functions of the County Clerk are mandated by a New York State statute, however, the staffing level required to record court and other documents are not specified in the authorizing statute. As such, in theory, the department could be staffed with one person.

The 2017 adopted budget of Suffolk County includes a mandated to discretionary ratio of 52% to 48%, respectively.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

Below is a breakdown of such functions included in Suffolk's budget.

SUFFOLK COUNTY - 2017 MANDATED EXPENSES (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)		
	Tax Advertising	\$ 0.4
	Court Facilities	44.2
	JFA Lease Payments	5.5
	MCTA Aid - LIRR	25.7
	Debt - DPW	3.0
Social Services		
	Handicapped Child	30.3
	DSS Medical Exams	1.7
	Medical Assistance	1.1
	Medicaid Cap Payment	241.1
	Family Assistance	70.0
	Institutional Foster Care	16.8
	Foster Care	6.3
	Adoption Subsidy	15.3
	Institutional Foster Care: Probation	10.9
	Safety Net	71.0
	HEAP	1.7
	Emergency Aid To Adults	2.4
	DSS Other Districts	0.5
	Medicaid Compliance	38.9
Employee Benefits		
	Retirement	175.5
Health Services		
	Education Of Handicapped services	123.4
	Medical Program	11.9
	Court Ordered Evaluation	1.7
Law		
	Bar Association: Indigent Defendants	4.2
Miscellaneous		
	Justices Of The Peace	0.1
	Judgments And Claims	0.2
	Out of County Tuition	13.8
	Police Academy	1.4
	Contribution To SCCC	37.4
Probation		
	Mandated Juvenile Detention Services	1.9
	State Training School	1.5
Sheriff		
	Correctional Facility	77.7
TOTAL MANDATED COSTS		\$1,035.1

Also of note, Suffolk County previously adopted a local law that required departments to reduce costs when State or Federal funding (including grants) was lost. With major proposed changes currently pending at the State and Federal level, adopting a similar provision could result in significant savings for the County and would assist in the development of a sustainable budget.

NIFA could request that the Budget Office include in the Budget Call Letter that departments identify projected losses in State or Federal aid and identify what costs they intend to cut to make up for any losses. Such actions could be taken without the County legislature formally adopting a procedure.

Westchester County

Following is a breakdown mandated and discretionary expenditures included in the Westchester County's 2017 adopted budget. Information pertaining to each of the sub-categories was not readily available. As such, expenditure totals are included for the primary categories but not at the sub-category level.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

WESTCHESTER COUNTY - 2017 MANDATED EXPENSES (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)		
Social Services		
	Medicaid	
	Child Protective Services, Child Support Enforcement	
	Family Emergency Assistance	
	Housing Placement; Homeless Services	
	TOTAL SOCIAL SERVICES:	\$603.0
Public Health		
	Communicable Disease Control	
	Environmental & Community Health	
	Early Intervention	
	Inspections	
	Public Health Laboratories	
	TOTAL PUBLIC HEALTH:	138.5
Corrections		
	County Jail; Penitentiary	
	TOTAL CORRECTIONS:	122.6
Sales Tax Distributions		
	Municipalities; School Districts	
	TOTAL SALES TAX DISTRIBUTIONS:	112.1
Probation		
	Family And Criminal Courts	
	TOTAL SALES TAX DISTRIBUTIONS:	25.1
District Attorney		
	Prosecutions	
	Special Bureaus: Narcotics; Gang & Gun; Stop DWI	
	High Tech Crime; Environmental Crime	
	Domestic Violence Bias Crimes; Child Abuse	
	Economic Crimes	
	TOTAL DISTRICT ATTORNEY:	27.5
Indigent Defense		
	Felony And Misdemeanor	
	Legal Aid Society of Westchester	
	TOTAL INDIGENT DEFENSE:	22.4
MTA		
	MTA Surcharge; MTA Mobility Tax	
	TOTAL MTA:	28.7
County Clerk		
	Land Records	
	Legal Documents	
	Passports	
	UCC Filings	
	TOTAL COUNTY CLERK:	6.8
Miscellaneous		
	NYS Courts (\$15.6 M)	
	Board of Elections (\$14.9 M)	
	Westchester Community College (\$29.8 M)	
	Pension (\$66.9 M)	
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS:	127.2
TOTAL MANDATED COSTS		\$1,214.0

WESTCHESTER COUNTY - 2017 DISCRETIONARY EXPENSES (IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)	
Public Works	
Bus System	
Infrastructure	
TOTAL PUBLIC WORKS:	\$143.1
Parks And Recreation	
17 parks; 6 golf courses; 5 conservation areas; 18,000 acres of open space	
Rye Playland; New Ballfields	
Westchester County Center	
Historic Sites; Bronx River Conservancy	
TOTAL PARKS AND RECREATION:	47.2
Public Safety	
DWI Program	
Units: Environmental Security, Bomb Squad, Special Ops., Canine, Aviation, Narcotics; Parkway Patrols; Highway Patrols	
Training Facilities For Local Departments.	
TOTAL PUBLIC SAFETY:	39.9
Labs And Research	
Forensics; Crime Labs	
TOTAL LABS AND RESEARCH:	3.0
Enrichment	
Cornell Cooperative; Westchester Library; Westchester Historical Society	
Arts; Tourism	
TOTAL ENRICHMENT:	5.2
Home And Community Services	
Senior Programs; Youth Services	
Youth Services	
TOTAL HOME AND COMMUNITY SERVICES:	7.2
Mental Health	
Case Management	
Depression Help Line	
Substance Abuse, Mental Health Court, Alternatives To Incarceration	
Alternatives To Incarceration	
TOTAL MENTAL HEALTH:	7.7
EMERGENCY SERVICES	
Special Operations; HAZMAT Team; Bomb Squad; Arson Unit	
Fire Training Facility	
Emergency Evacuation; WMD Response	
24/7 county-wide fire & EMS	
TOTAL EMERGENCY SERVICES:	5.8
Planning	
Open Space; Land Use – Westchester 2025; Water Quality	
Affordable Housing; Farm Protection	
Community / Economic Development	
TOTAL PLANNING:	4.2
Miscellaneous	
Employee Fringe (\$183.5 M)	
Administrative Support And Other (\$83.2 M)	
Debt Service (\$81.1 M)	
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS:	347.8
TOTAL DISCRETIONARY COSTS	\$611.1

As detailed in the previous two tables, the 2017 adopted budget of Westchester County includes \$1.2 billion in mandated expenditures and \$611.1 million in expenditures deemed to be discretionary. The ratio of mandated to discretionary costs for 2017 is 66.5% to 33.5%, respectively. Although less conservative than Suffolk County, Westchester is considerably more lenient when compared to the County.

Dutchess County

Following is a breakdown mandated and discretionary expenditures as reported in the 2017 adopted budget of Dutchess County. Information pertaining to each of the sub-categories was not readily available. As such, expenditure totals are included for the primary categories but not at the sub-category level.

Although, less conservative than Suffolk and Westchester counties, the Dutchess County Budget Office estimates that approximately 70% of net costs in the 2017 adopted budget correlate to mandated programs and functions. The remaining 30% correlate to areas deemed as discretionary, such as health and mental health services, sheriff road patrols, road repair, snow removal, public transportation, 911 dispatch, and senior services.

(The remainder of this page has been left intentionally blank.)

DOLLAR BILL ALLOCATION		
Mandated	Expenditures (000,000)s	%
Prosecution & Defense	\$12.3	4.45%
Medicaid- Medical Services For Income Eligible Residents	43.7	15.76
Special Education Services	10.8	3.89
Economic Assistance- Financial Assistance, Adult And Child Protective Services, Foster Care, Adoption, Child Institutional Care, And Housing Assistance	39.7	14.31
Probation	9.0	3.25
Sheriff & Jail	40.2	14.48
Other Mandated Services (Election & Engineering)	10.4	3.74
Community College	18.9	6.80
Behavioral And Community Health	8.1	2.92
TOTAL MANDATED	\$193.1	69.60%
Discretionary		
Sheriff, E-911, And Probation	\$30.2	10.90%
Behavioral And Community Health	12.4	4.47
Economic Development & Planning	7.2	2.60
Other	4.7	1.68
Debt Service	11.5	4.16
Road Repair & Snow Removal	16.3	5.88
Parks & Recreation	1.9	0.70
TOTAL DISCRETIONARY	\$84.2	39.40%
TOTAL – ALL EXPENDITURES	\$277.3	100.00%

END OF APPENDIX A